APRIL 1966

FIFTY CENTS

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

VOL. 17
11

AFTER THE TRICONTINENTAL

- FIDEL CASTRO
- ADOLFO GILLY
- THE EDITORS

The City Is the Black Man's Land
BY GRACE AND JAMES BOGGS

LICENSED TO UN2.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS | VOLUME SEVENTEEN NUMBER 11 APRIL 1966

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: The Tricontinental and After 1
FROM CASTRO'S CLOSING SPEECH 12
A CONFERENCE WITHOUT GLORY AND WITHOUT PROGRAM by Adolfo Gilly 21
THE CITY IS THE BLACK MAN'S LAND by Grace and James Boggs 35
MONOPOLY IN THE UNITED STATES by David Michaels 47
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 54
CONTENTS OF VOLUME XVII 62

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August when bimonthly, and copyright © 1966, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.

EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: USA: 333 Sixth Avenue, New York, New York 10014. Telephone: CHelsea 2-6494.
Europe: Frances Kelly, 9 King Edward Mansions, 629 Fulham Road, London, S.W.6., Telephone: Renown 8824.
Latin America: Editorial Perspectivas, Av. Roque Saenz Peña 760, (of. 531) Buenos Aires, Argentina
Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 188 High Street, Nutley, N. J.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—$6 in the U.S.; $7 foreign.
By 1st class mail—U.S. $10; elsewhere $11.
By air mail—No. America $11; So. America and Europe $15; Asia (incl. USSR), Africa, Australia $17.

EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

As part of our expansion program for MONTHLY REVIEW we are now opening an office in London to be headed by our Associate Editor, Frances Kelly. Our Spanish edition brought us in close touch with the Latin American continent and now we hope to cover Europe with equal success. In future, most MR Press books will be published in London as well as in New York and will be available there through the usual bookstore channels. Readers in Great Britain will be able to obtain the books at prepublication prices, and later at list prices, by paying in pounds sterling to the London office. Subscriptions for Great Britain will also be handled henceforth through London and an explanatory letter will soon be sent to subscribers there. We hope to maintain the same close contact with British readers that we now have with those in the United States. Frances Kelly's address is 9 King Edward Mansions, 629 Fulham Road, London, S.W.6 (telephone: Renown 8824) and she will welcome any subscribers who care to get in touch with her.

Two new and, we believe, important MR Press books should be completed in time for the opening of the 1966-1967 academic year.

(*continued on inside back cover*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TRICONTINENTAL AND AFTER

In his closing speech to the Tricontinental Conference held in Havana during the first half of January, Fidel Castro launched a fierce attack on the Guatemalan guerrilla movement, "MR-13," led by Antonio Yon Sosa and on the Argentine journalist Adolfo Gilly who has probably done more than anyone else to acquaint the world with the character and achievements of MR-13. Since Gilly's most comprehensive reportage on the Guatemalan guerrillas appeared in this magazine (in the issues of April and May of last year), and since Gilly is also a frequent and valued contributor to MONTHLY REVIEW, we are devoting a large part of this issue to printing the relevant part of Castro's speech and Gilly's reply, the latter taking the form of a general critique of the Conference itself. In this editorial we attempt to clarify MR's position on some of the principal issues in this politically very important controversy.

On Trotskyism

One aspect of the Castro speech is ugly and perhaps ominous. His attack on MR-13 rests entirely on two propositions: first, that it is "infiltrated" by Trotskyites and has a Trotskyist program; and second, that Trotskyites are agents of imperialism. If the second proposition were true, the first would of course be a devastating indictment of MR-13. But the accusation has no foundation whatever, as anyone who has seriously studied the history of the communist movement since the October Revolution must know. It was precisely this accusation which provided the rationalization for the Soviet purge trials of the 1930's. If anything has been proved—and not least by the Soviet government itself—it is that the trials were a shameless frame-up; and no evidence has ever been produced to restore credibility to the accusation. To revive it now is a sure sign of either ignorance or malice. For our part, we prefer to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

believe that in this matter Fidel himself is ignorant and that the malice comes from advisers who never abandoned the attitudes and methods which underlay the trials. If so, it behooves Fidel to take time out for serious study of the history of the movement to which he is, for reasons which do him no discredit, a latecomer (he could do worse than begin with Isaac Deutscher's brilliant three-volume study of Trotsky which is much more than a personal biography). In the meantime, one can only hope that Fidel's bad example is not going to lead to a revival of the kind of witch-hunting which so bedeviled and stultified the world revolutionary movement in the Stalin era.

As to the rest of the indictment of MR-13, that there are Trotskyites in the movement and that it has a Trotskyist program, we neither know nor care whether or to what extent it is true. In our opinion, the only kind of revolution that has any chance of succeeding in Latin America today is a socialist revolution. We were, we believe, among the first to say that the Cuban Revolution would be forced to advance rapidly to socialism—or be overthrown. After visiting South America in 1963 we stated our opinion in these pages that there is no such thing as feudalism in Latin America and that it therefore makes no sense to talk about a bourgeois revolution. When the Guatemalan guerrillas, conducting an armed struggle against the bloody dictatorship imposed on their country by the CIA and United Fruit, adopted a program reflecting similar, if not identical, ideas, we hailed the event as an historic breakthrough. Nothing that has happened since, including Fidel Castro's name-calling attack, has caused us to change our minds. If Fidel wants to argue rationally about the validity of MR-13's program, well and good; let him do so. He will find no lack of serious revolutionaries to weigh his views with all the respect and attention due the leader of the Cuban Revolution. But he should not deceive himself that he can sway any but cowards and sycophants by mere denunciations.

One more point in this connection: Whatever its role in Guatemala, Trotskyism is certainly not a large or important political force in Latin America as a whole. But if Fidel Castro and the Latin American Communist Parties duck the question of socialism, and still more if they attack as Trotskyites all those

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who openly struggle for a specifically socialist revolution, then the prospects for Latin American Trotskyism will be vastly improved. For the necessity, and indeed the inevitability, of socialist revolution, not in some vague future but as the next historical stage in Latin America is rooted in the underdeveloped, imperialist-enforced reality of that region. This is not to say that socialist revolution is coming in Latin America tomorrow or next year: great historical changes do not happen that way. It is simply to say that no other kind of revolution is possible in Latin America and that sooner or later all serious revolutionaries are going to have to come to terms with that fact.

The Achievement of the Conference

Gilly's evaluation of the Tricontinental Conference is wholly negative—a Conference "without glory and without program," he calls it. This seems to us to result from a lack of proper perspective.

It was a great, indeed a "glorious" achievement to bring together delegations representing revolutionary and anti-imperialist organizations in scores of Asian, African, and Latin American countries. New and lasting contacts and channels of communication were opened up. Views and experiences were exchanged, perhaps more in private than in public sessions. Above all, the Conference aroused and gave dramatic expression to an unprecedented sense of revolutionary militancy and international solidarity among the victims of imperialism. The right and duty to meet imperialist violence, exemplified for all to see in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, by revolutionary counter-violence was the central theme of the entire Conference. As Marcel Niedergang reported from Havana in *Le Monde* of January 20th, "revolutionary enthusiasm easily carried the day, and the Soviets who arrived with resolutions of prudence were obliged to intone the same refrain."

The Havana Conference, in other words, sounded the death knell of all those narcotic illusions of peaceful coexistence and peaceful transition which lie at the very heart of modern revisionism; it brought closer the day when, in the words of the *Communist Manifesto,* "man is at last compelled to face with sober senses his real condition of life and his relations with his

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

kind." Can it really be said that this was not a great achievement?

Do not misunderstand us. We do not maintain that the policies for which these illusions provide the rationalization are themselves dead. In the report already cited, Marcel Niedergang stated, with evident agreement, that "certain observers" at the Conference considered the concessions made by the Soviet delegation "purely verbal and formal." But is it really of no importance that they felt it necessary to make such concessions? Has not the Havana Conference thrown down a profound challenge to the Soviet leadership, and indeed to the whole Soviet people? And is it too much to hope that mounting pressures of this kind will eventually force a change of policy and perhaps even a change of leadership in the Soviet Union?

The Position of Fidel Castro

Gilly asserts without qualification that Castro, as the ally of the Soviet leadership, has now espoused the line and policy of peaceful coexistence. In our view this is an oversimplification and distortion of a much more complex reality. To convince oneself of this, one need only read the major speeches by the Cubans at the Conference—the opening speech of President Dorticós, that of Osmany Cienfuegos, the secretary of the new tricontinental organization set up by the Conference, and the closing speech of Fidel. We quote from the last:

> The world is big and the imperialists are everywhere. And for Cuban revolutionaries the battlefield against imperialism covers the whole globe! (Prolonged applause)
>
> Without boasting and without immodesty, that is the way we Cuban revolutionaries understand our internationalist duty; that is the way our people understand their duty, because they realize that the enemy is one and the same; the same who attacks our coasts and our land, the same who attacks others. And because of that we state and proclaim that revolutionary movements in any corner of the globe can count on Cuban combatants. (Prolonged applause). . . .
>
> If Yankee imperialists take the liberty of bombing wherever they wish and of sending their mercenary troops to suppress the revolutionary movement in any part of the world, revolutionary peoples feel they have the right to help, even with their physical

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

presence (Applause) the peoples who fight against the Yankee imperialists.

And thus if each one helps according to his capacity, if each one helps according to his possibilities, the Yankee imperialists will be defeated. And if there is any place where they are doomed to suffer a crushing defeat, that place is Southeast Asia. (Applause)

Because there it is possible to establish a correlation of forces incomparably superior to those of the Yankee imperialists.

That is why we have not the slightest doubt that they will be defeated, that they will be crushed by the people themselves of that area, and if they increase their forces and those of their reactionary allies, they will be defeated not only by the forces of the peoples of that area, but by the forces of the socialist camp and of the other peoples. (Applause) That is why the Yankee imperialists launch their hypocritical peace offensive in order to create confusion and deception. And that is why the peoples of Vietnam have correctly stated that peace, true peace, can only be achieved when the Yankee imperialists cease attacking, when the Yankee imperialists no longer occupy the territory or part of the territory of Vietnam and when the Yankee imperialists withdraw their mercenary troops and dismantle their military bases in the territory of Vietnam. . . .

And if we were in a similar situation, I am completely sure that we would say exactly the same. (Applause) We would refuse to negotiate under bombardment, we would refuse to negotiate while under occupation. . . .

In Latin America there should not be just one, or two, or three peoples struggling alone against imperialism. The correlation of the forces of the imperialists on this Continent, the proximity of its metropolitan territory, the zeal with which they will try to defend their dominions in this part of the world, require a common strategy on this Continent more than anywhere else: a common and simultaneous struggle. (Applause) If the imperialists have to face not just the Dominican people alone, or the Guatemalan people alone, or the Venezuelan people alone, or the Peruvian people alone; if they must also fight—at the same time as in each of these countries—against other oppressed peoples, such as those of Brazil, Bolivia, Paraguay, Ecuador, Argentina (Applause) and other peoples of Central America; if the struggle is carried out on a broad scale, if each one of these peoples, if each one of the revolutionaries of this Continent fulfills his duty . . . then the hour of liberation of this Continent will be nearer.

It would be simply absurd to assert that this is nothing but "purely verbal and formal" rhetoric designed to cover up secret support for the line of peaceful coexistence. Rather it comes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the heart of the real Fidel Castro who is as much a revolutionary and a fighter today as he ever was. It is also true, however, that by attacking the Chinese and MR-13 Castro has taken a position on the Soviet side of the great division in the world communist movement. There is a real contradiction here: on the one hand Fidel is passionately advocating the very policies of armed national liberation struggle which the Soviets would like to abandon in the interests of a deal with the United States; on the other hand he joins the Soviets in attacking not only a small movement which is putting these policies into practice but also China, the socialist giant which is standing firm against United States blackmail and by so doing is creating a situation in which the national liberation struggles of Asia, Africa, and Latin America have a chance to develop and mature. The trouble with Gilly is that he fails to recognize the reality of this contradiction and hence of course is precluded from understanding its implications.

Out of contradictions come movement and change and so it will be here, for it is unlikely that Fidel will be able to continue indefinitely lining up with the Russians against the Chinese and at the same time throwing Cuba's weight behind the broadening and deepening of the national liberation struggles of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.* As pressures and tensions mount—primarily those emanating from the developing national liberation struggles themselves—he will be increasingly forced to choose, not only in words but also in deeds.

---

* That Fidel's support for these struggles was not confined to public utterances is confirmed by the correspondent of *Le Monde*. "It was really behind closed doors . . . that the discussions between Fidel Castro . . . and the Latin American delegations took place. They occurred in a feverish atmosphere and uninterruptedly from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. and from 8 p.m. to 1 a.m. 'We didn't even dare ask for a sandwich,' said some of the Latin Americans unaccustomed to this pace; and Fidel certainly lived up to his nickname of 'horse.' During this session there were shouts, quarrels, focusing of issues, self criticisms, and a discourse by Fidel Castro which all delegates agreed was 'remarkable.' 'Without this long meeting of Latin Americans' the delegates further said, 'the Tricontinental would have left us with a feeling of dissatisfaction.' It seems that this long 'synthetic report' by Fidel Castro included the following themes: the victory of the Cuban Revolution was not an historical accident. 'What we

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The situation is much too obscure and complicated to permit predictions at this stage, but it seems worthwhile to stress two things which will certainly play an important part in determining the outcome. The first is the fate of Che Guevara, the second the condition of the Cuban economy.

In his final speech to the Conference, Castro said that "some day mankind will learn all the facts. That will be the day when the villains will see that comrade Guevara was not murdered; each of his steps will be fully known." Let us hope so, and let us hope that the day comes soon. For Fidel should be under no illusions that only imperialists and their agents are interested in Che's fate. More than anyone else, even more than Fidel himself, Che has come to symbolize all that is best, all that is pure, all that is beloved in the Cuban Revolution, a great historic event which belongs not only to seven million Cubans but to all the people of the Americas and indeed to all mankind. If, as some charge, anything untoward has happened or should happen to Che, those responsible (and that would necessarily include all who knew and kept silent) will be forever disgraced. A Cuban regime guilty of such a crime would lose its moral authority and either would be replaced or would degenerate into a police state. In the latter case, of course, the worst bureaucratic elements would rise to the top and do whatever was demanded of them by their more powerful counterparts abroad.

---

have succeeded in doing in Cuba you can do yourselves. Our conditions of struggle were not all that favorable. To take only one example, before the fall of Batista, Havana University was largely nonpolitical. Today, on the contrary, the universities in Latin America are active arenas of progressivism.' Second point: it is clear today that 'imperialism is on guard' and that 'the United States will never accept the loss of Latin America.' Hence, repeating one of the phrases of his Saturday speech, 'sooner or later the peoples are going to have to take up arms to liberate themselves.' A new 'lesson': 'Unity is an essential condition for success.' It is indispensable to 'surmount the divergencies, the rivalries, and the conflicts of tendencies' which weaken the 'revolutionary front.' It is no less indispensable to 'coordinate the struggle' and to 'study very seriously the objective and subjective conditions of this struggle in the different countries.'" Calling this a "resolutely Cuban game," *Le Monde's* correspondent permitted himself to wonder what will be the real reaction to it of the Soviets.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the other hand, if the official Cuban story about Che turns out to be correct, if he reappears as a revolutionary fighter and theorist elsewhere, and if he retains his close ties to Fidel and his other former comrades in the Sierra Maestra, then the bonds linking the Cuban and world revolutions will be strengthened and the chances of a favorable evolution inside Cuba will be immeasurably improved. Is Fidel Castro aware of the real issues at stake in the Guevara affair? And does he realize that every day's delay in clearing up the mystery brings anxiety and doubt to honest revolutionaries everywhere and joy to their enemies?

The relevance of the condition of the Cuban economy to Fidel's future evolution is perhaps less obvious but probably not less important. The first impulse of the revolutionary government after it came to power was to diversify agriculture and drastically reduce Cuba's dependence on sugar. In this way, it was thought, Cuba could end the anomalous, and indeed scandalous, situation in which one of the world's potentially richest agricultural areas fell far short of feeding its own inhabitants. But the problems of diversifying agriculture turned out to be more difficult than had been anticipated, and the advantages of expanding sugar production for seemingly assured markets in the socialist countries appeared to be so attractive that the early enthusiasm for diversification died out and Cuba returned to a policy of heavy dependence on a single crop. It now appears that this may have been a serious mistake which could have grievous consequences for Cuba's future.

The real problem is not whether in abstract theory the socialist countries should or should not foster a high degree of international division of labor: the question is whether in the world as it actually exists—with all its conflicts and uncertainties and potential disasters—any particular socialist country can afford the risk of excessive dependence on others. Cuba's recent experience in having its rice supply drastically cut by the Chinese decision to buy less sugar and sell less rice to Cuba in 1966 than in 1965 certainly suggests a negative answer. In saying this we mean to imply no criticism of the Chinese action. The reasons they gave the Cubans for their decision with respect to rice are valid and justified, and we

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

think the Cubans should have accepted them as such instead of launching, as Castro did in his speech of February 5th, a vulgar and unbridled attack on the Chinese. Here are the Chinese reasons as quoted by Fidel himself: "(a) The need to create a reserve in case of any attack by the U.S. imperialists. (b) The aid they have to give Vietnam. (c) A deficit in the production of other grains which forces them to import from the capitalist area and hence to use some rice in order to obtain foreign exchange for that purpose."* At the Tricontinental Conference Fidel talked a lot about the duty of all revolutionaries to help Vietnam and carry on the struggle against imperialism. Does he now presume to tell the Chinese, who are doing most of the helping and a large part of the struggling, that all that comes after the duty to supply Cuba with the amount of rice it asks for?

But the point we wish to emphasize here concerns not the specifics of the Cuban-Chinese rice trade but the general situation in which Cuba finds itself. Cuba's dependence on China is, after all, much less than its dependence on the Soviet Union. Under present circumstances, Cuba's vulnerability to shifts in Soviet policy, no matter what their motives or justification, or simply to being cut off from the Soviet Union, which could easily happen as imperialism's war of intervention in Latin America spreads and intensifies—this vulnerability is extreme and mortally dangerous.

The conclusion seems obvious: If Fidel wants Cuba to be in a position to follow a relatively independent course—to continue, in Marcel Niedergang's words, to play "a resolutely Cuban game"—in the explosively tense and stormy period which lies ahead, he had better return as quickly as possible to a policy of agricultural diversification and self-sufficiency in foodstuffs.

The Struggle for a Socialist Orientation

The Tricontinental Conference laid to rest once and for all the illusion of peaceful coexistence between imperialism and

* *Granma,* English edition, February 6. Castro's speech is also published in full in *Peking Review* of February 28th.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its victims. This was a great historic achievement. But—and here we are in full agreement with Gilly—it is not enough. It is not enough for the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America to know that they must expel the imperialists from their lands by force of arms, or even to understand that by acting all together they can achieve this goal despite the imperialists' enormous technical superiority. They must also have a clear idea of what they are going to put in the place of the miserable underdeveloped capitalist societies which the departing imperialists will leave behind. And here we are completely convinced that the only viable answer is socialism.

There is no such thing as a progressive capitalist society in the period of world revolution and the general crisis of capitalism.

There is no such thing as a bourgeois class which has an interest, as a class, in fighting imperialism.

Coalitions between revolutionaries and supposedly progressive bourgeois classes are bound to result in stultification at best and disaster at worst (the horrible slaughter in Indonesia, until recently a showpiece of anti-imperialist coalition politics, should drive this lesson indelibly into the consciousness of every revolutionary).

Only a workers' and peasants' state, disposing over society's basic productive apparatus and prepared to plan and act in the interests of the victims of four centuries of exploitation and underdevelopment, can possibly clean out the Augean stables of imperialist-backed capitalism and lay the foundations of a better future.

These are the truths which must become as self-evident in the last third of the 20th century as were the truths proclaimed in our own Declaration of Independence in the last third of the 18th century. An unremitting struggle to that end must be undertaken within all the revolutionary and anti-imperialist organizations of the world, and not least within the new organization of solidarity of the Asian, African, and Latin American peoples established by the Havana Conference.

A second Tricontinental Conference is scheduled to be held in Cairo in 1968. If it merely repeats the slogans and resolutions of the Havana Conference—anti-imperialism, armed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

struggle, unity—it will indeed be a Conference "without glory and without program." The time has now come to take a giant step forward, to go beyond Havana, to proclaim socialism as the necessary and indispensable condition of real national liberation. That must be the object and goal for Cairo.

In the meantime, one final point: nothing we have said implies the isolation of the socialist—that is, the workers' and peasants'—movement from progressive elements of the bourgeoisie. The prospects of success in this connection have never been as bright as they are now. But that does not mean that alliances with bourgeois classes or sub-classes (national bourgeoisie, petty bourgeoisie, etc.) are either rational or feasible. To think so is simply to betray a woeful ignorance of contemporary reality. What is needed is an understanding that what Marx and Engels said in the *Manifesto,* perhaps in partial explanation of their own uncompromising revolutionary position, holds true today in the underdeveloped countries to an unparalleled degree. Every revolutionary should take these words to heart:

> Finally, in times when the class struggle nears the decisive hour, the process of dissolution going on within the ruling class, in fact within the whole range of old society, assumes such a violent, glaring character, that a small section of the ruling class cuts itself adrift and joins the revolutionary class, the class that holds the future in its hands. Just as, therefore, at an earlier period, a section of the nobility went over to the bourgeoisie, so now a portion of the bourgeoisie goes over to the proletariat, and in particular a portion of the bourgeois ideologists who have raised themselves to the level of comprehending theoretically the historical movement as a whole.

These people are abandoning their own class, and for good and sufficient reason—because their class has become the enemy of humanity. The object of the proletariat, using that term in its broadest and now most relevant meaning, must be to maximize the number of such converts, not to deceive itself into believing that pacts can be made with the enemy itself.

(March 8, 1966)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FROM CASTRO'S CLOSING SPEECH

We reproduce here a part of Fidel Castro's closing speech at the Tricontinental Conference, delivered in Havana on January 15th.* This is the part which attacks Trotskyism and singles out Adolfo Gilly, a frequent contributor to MR, for special condemnation. Gilly's reply, containing his assessment of the results of the Conference, is included in this issue of MR beginning on page 21. Our own comments will be found in the Review of the Month above.—*The Editors.*

There is a fact I am going to mention, as an example showing how imperialism and its agents work, and it is extremely interesting. I refer to the campaign carried out by imperialism and its agents with regard to the departure of our comrade, Ernesto Guevara (Applause).

I think this is a matter which has to be taken by the "horns" (Laughter) in order to make some things clearer.

A few revolutionaries in this country, and some few outside of this country, know when comrade Ernesto Guevara left, what he has been doing all this time; and of course the imperialists would be most eager to learn, in every detail, where he is, what he has done, how he is doing it.

Of course, apparently they do not know it and, if they do, they conceal it. (Laughter.)

But naturally, these are matters which in time, when circumstances allow it, will be clarified. However, for us, revolutionaries, these clarifications are not necessary; it is the enemy who tries to use these circumstances in order to scheme, to create confusion, and to slander.

Comrade Guevara joined us during our exile in Mexico, and always, from the very first day, he clearly expressed the idea that when the struggle was completed in Cuba, he would have other duties to fulfill in another place, and we always

* The text is taken from the English edition of *Granma,* "Special Supplement on the Tricontinental," Havana, January 1966.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gave him our word that no state interest, no national interest, no circumstances would lead us to ask him to remain in our country, or hinder him from carrying out that wish, that desire. And we fully and faithfully kept that promise made to comrade Guevara (Applause).

Naturally, if comrade Guevara was going to leave the country, it was logical for him to do it secretly, it was logical for him to move secretly, it was logical for him not to be in contact with journalists, it was logical for him not to give any press conferences. It was logical for him to act as he did, because of the task he proposed to undertake.

And, yet, how the imperialists have tried to derive profit from this circumstance and how they have used it!

That is why I have brought some papers with me. Don't be alarmed, thinking that I am going to read all of them. I am merely going to read several things, for here is what all imperialist and bourgeois papers have written with regard to the case of Major Guevara, what the newspapers in the United States have written, their magazines, their news agencies, the bourgeois newspapers of Latin America and those of the entire world. And let us see who, precisely, have been the main spokesmen in the imperialist campaign of intrigue and slander against Cuba in regard to the case of comrade Guevara. To begin with, certain elements have been used constantly during the last decades against the revolutionary movement.

And so, if you will concede me a little time, I will look for a very interesting item among a great many.

Ah, I found it. (Laughter and Applause.) This is a UPI cable dated December 6, 1965, which reads: "Ernesto Guevara was murdered by Cuban Prime Minister Fidel Castro (Shouts) following orders from the USSR" (Shouts), "declared Felipe Albaguante, leader of the Mexican Trotskyites, in a statement made to *El Universal*. He adds that Che was liquidated because he insisted on aligning Cuba with the Chinese line." (Shouts.)

This, naturally, was in tone with a campaign that Trotskyite elements began to launch everywhere simultaneously.

And on October 22, the weekly *Marcha* published an article in which a well-known Trotskyite theorist, Adolfo Gilly, stated that Che had left Cuba because of differences with Fidel aris-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing from the Sino-Soviet conflict, and that Che could not impose his opinions on the leadership. He said that Che, in a confused manner, advocated extending the revolution to the rest of Latin America, in opposition to the Soviet line; that the Cuban leadership is divided between a conservative wing, including old leaders of the Popular Socialist Party, and the followers of Che and Fidel, with its team in a central, oscillating, and conciliatory position. He added that Che had left Cuba because he lacked means to express himself, and that Fidel was afraid to face the masses and explain Che's case.

This same Trotskyite theorist on October 31, 1965, writing in the Italian publication *Nuovo Mondo* in an article branding the Cuban leadership as pro-Soviet and accusing Fidel of not having explained politically to the people what had happened to Che, says that Major Guevara was defeated by the Popular Socialist Party and the Castroite team; he criticizes Che for not having taken his struggle to impose his own political theory to the masses, and finishes by saying that the Cuban state, paralyzed by its policy, did not openly support the Dominican Revolution.

And I am going to refer to this a bit more fully a little further on.

In the issue of October, 1965, of the newspaper *Batalla,* organ of the Spanish Trotskyites, it was stated that the mystery surrounding the case of Che Guevara ought to be cleared up. It said that friends of Che supposed that the letter read by Castro was false and ask themselves whether the Cuban leadership tends towards submission to the Kremlin bureaucracy.

On approximately the same date, the official Trotskyite organ in Argentina published an article affirming that Che is dead, or in prison in Cuba. It said ". . . he entered into conflict with Fidel Castro because of the operation of the Trade Unions and the organization of the militia."

It added that "Che was opposed to the Central Committee being composed of the favorites of Castro, especially the army officers, followers of the Moscow right wing."

But one of the dirtiest, most insulting and most indecent writings was that by the leader of the Latin-American Political Bureau of the Fourth International in the Italian publication

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lotta Operaia. From this article, extremely long, I shall read only three paragraphs.

It begins by saying:

An aspect of the deepening of the world-wide crisis of bureaucracy is the expulsion of Guevara. Guevara was thrown out now, and not eight months ago. The discussion with Guevara lasted eight months, which were not spent drinking coffee; they have fought rigorously and perhaps there have been deaths; perhaps they discussed at gun point. We cannot say if Guevara has been killed or not, but the right to suppose that they have killed him exists. Why does Guevara not appear? They have not shown him in Havana, fearing the consequences, and the reaction of the population. But, after all, hiding him produces the same effect: the population asks why Guevara does not come out, does not appear. There is no political accusation; he is politically praised.

Why have they not shown Guevara? Why has he not spoken? How is it possible that one of the founders of the Cuban workers' state, who a short time ago travelled throughout the world on behalf of that workers' state, should suddenly say: I have grown weary of the Cuban Revolution; I will make revolution elsewhere?

On the other hand, they do not say where he has gone, and he does not show up. If there is no divergence, why does he not appear? The entire Cuban people understand that there is a tremendous struggle, and that this struggle is not over.

Guevara was and is not alone. If they take such measures against Guevara, it is because he has great support. And besides this great support, there is enormous concern among the people.

Not long ago, the Cuban government published a rather severe decree: all arms must be returned to the state. At that moment, the issue was a bit confused. Now the objective of that resolution is clear: it was against the Guevara faction. They are afraid of an uprising.

Another paragraph:

Why have they silenced Guevara? The Fourth International must carry on a public campaign in this respect, demanding the appearance of Guevara, the right of Guevara to defend himself and discuss, appeal to the masses, not to trust the measures adopted by the Cuban government, because these are methods of bureaucrats and maybe murderers. They have eliminated Guevara to silence his struggle; they have silenced Guevara, despite the fact that his position was not consequent from the viewpoint of a revolu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tionary, because it tried to harmonize his position within the revolutionary trend.

And further on it says:

This demonstrates, not the power of Guevara or of a pro-Guevara group in Cuba, but the maturity of the conditions in the rest of the workers' states so that in a short time these positions will bear fruit. Bureaucracy is not deceived by procedures and methods of this kind. To bureaucracy, the elimination of Guevara means an attempt to eliminate a base for possible regrouping of revolutionary tendencies which continue to develop World Revolution. This is the basis of Guevara's elimination; and not only for the danger this represents to Cuba, but because it includes the rest of the Latin American Revolution.

Guatemala is on Cuba's side, with the program of the Socialist Revolution. And notwithstanding its strength and the speeches of its leader, Fidel Castro, Cuba has not been able to prevent the transformation of the "13th of November" Movement into a Socialist revolutionary movement which fights directly for socialism.

It is by no means a coincidence that this gentleman, leader of the Fourth International, mentions here very proudly the case of Guatemala and the "13th of November" Movement because precisely in regard to this Movement Yankee imperialism has used one of the most subtle tactics to liquidate a revolutionary movement, that is, the infiltration of agents of the Fourth International in it, who brought it to adopt—on account of the lack of political knowledge of the principal leader of this Movement—this discredited thing, this anti-historic thing, this fraudulent thing which emanates from individuals so known to be at the service of Yankee imperialism, as is the program of the Fourth International.

How did this happen? Yon Sosa was, undoubtedly, a patriotic officer. Yon Sosa heads the movement of a group of Army officers—as a matter of fact, the mercenary troops who later invaded Girón took part in the crushing of this movement—and through an individual who was a merchant, who took charge of the political part of the movement, the Fourth International arranged matters so that this leader, lacking knowledge of the profound political and historical problems of revolutionary thought, allowed that agent of Trotskyism—who we

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have not the slightest doubt is an agent of imperialism—to take charge of editing a newspaper in which the program of the Fourth International was copied from head to tail.

What the Fourth International thus committed was a true crime against the revolutionary movement, to isolate it from the rest of the people, to isolate it from the masses, by corrupting it with the stupidities, the discredit and the repugnant and nauseating thing that is Trotskyism today within the field of politics. (Applause.) For if Trotskyism represented at a certain stage an erroneous position, but a position within the field of political ideas, Trotskyism became in later years a vulgar instrument of imperialism and reaction.

These gentlemen reason in such a way that, for instance, with regard to South Vietnam, where a vast revolutionary front has united the immense majority of the people and has closely grouped different sectors of the population around the liberation movement in the struggle against imperialism, to Trotskyites this is absurd, it is counter-revolutionary. And these gentlemen have the incredible effrontery to express themselves in this way when faced with the facts and the realities of history and of the revolutionary movements.

Fortunately, the revolutionary movement in Guatemala was saved. And it was saved because of the clear vision of one of the officers who, together with Sosa, had started the revolutionary movement, and who, on understanding that folly, that stupidity, broke away from the "13th of November Movement" and organized, with other progressive and revolutionary sectors, the Rebel Armed Forces of Guatemala (Applause).

And this young officer, who had such a clear vision of the situation, is the representative of the revolutionary movement of Guatemala in this Conference, Major Turcios (Prolonged Applause). Major Turcios has to his credit not only having been one of the first in the armed struggle for the liberation of his oppressed people, but also the merit of having saved the Guatemalan revolutionary movement from one of the most subtle and perfidious stratagems of Yankee imperialism. He raised the revolutionary flag of Guatemala and its anti-imperialist movement, rescuing it from the dirty hands of mercenaries in the service of Yankee imperialism.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And we hope that Yon Sosa, whose patriotic intentions at the beginning of the struggle are not in doubt, and whose condition as an honest man is not in doubt—although we do have very serious reservations about his attitude as a revolutionary leader—will not take too long to separate himself from those elements and rejoin the revolutionary movement in Guatemala, but this time under another leadership, under another leader who demonstrated, in moments such as those, clarity of vision and the attitude of a revolutionary leader (Applause).

This position adopted by the Trotskyites is the same as that adopted by all the newspapers and news agencies of Yankee imperialism; the same as that adopted in the case of comrade Ernesto Guevara by all the imperialist press in the United States, by its news agencies, by the Cuban counter-revolutionary press, by the bourgeois press in all the Continent and in the rest of the world. That is to say, this campaign of slander and intrigue against Revolutionary Cuba in the case of comrade Guevara made all the reactionary and bourgeois sectors of the imperialists, all the slanders and all the intriguers against the Cuban Revolution, coincide exactly.

Because it is unquestionable that only reaction and only imperialism can be interested in discrediting the Cuban Revolution, in destroying the faith which the revolutionary movements have placed in the Cuban Revolution, in destroying the confidence the peoples of Latin America have placed in the Cuban Revolution, in destroying their faith. And that is the reason why they have not hesitated to use the filthiest and most indecent weapons.

This same Gilly, who once in a while poses among other U.S. intellectuals in the MONTHLY REVIEW, a magazine of the United States, was villainous enough to write the following paragraph, which is well worth analyzing, on the crisis of the Dominican Republic. This is what he said: "The culminating point of this crisis must have been the Dominican Revolution, where the state of the Cuban workers was paralyzed by its own policy, without openly supporting the Revolution, although in Cuba there was tremendous internal pressure for a policy of active support. If this crisis was previous to that of the Domin-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ican Republic, undoubtedly the Dominican Republic hastened the revolution."

This person had the vileness to accuse the Cuban Revolution of not having given active aid to the Revolution in the Dominican Republic. And while the imperialists were accusing Cuba, while they were trying to justify their intervention with the pretext that leftists and Communists, trained in Cuba, were heading the uprising there; while imperialism was accusing Cuba and presenting the Dominican Revolution, not as an internal question but as an external problem, this person accused the Revolution of not having given active aid.

And what does active aid mean? Did they expect that Cuba, whose weapons and resources are well known, could stop and should stop the landing of U.S. troops in the Dominican Republic? Cuba has weapons to defend itself and has these defense weapons in an infinitely inferior number with relation to the imperialists. And these gentlemen are so despicable, so shameless, that they blame Cuba for not having prevented. . . . Because what else does active support mean? Because all that Cuba could do under those circumstances, all that it could have done, and should have done, it did. To ask Cuba to prevent the landing is like asking Cambodia in Southeast Asia to prevent bombings of North Vietnam, and to prevent occupation of South Vietnam by Yankee marines (Applause).

Unfortunately, the forces of Cuba are limited. But to the extent of these forces, in the best way possible, and in the most decided manner, as well as the most adequate in the circumstances, Cuba lends and will lend its maximum support to the Revolution.

To those who believe that this country is afraid of the imperialists, to those who believe—with a spirit of superiority or with insolent deliriums of superiority over everybody—that this country is afraid of the imperialists—it would have been worth their while to have lived a few hours, here, in this country, during the October Crisis, when, for the first time a small people like ours saw itself threatened with a massive attack of nuclear weapons on its territory, and to have seen the attitude taken by this people and the attitude taken by the Revolutionary Government (Applause).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A lot of nonsense, a lot of nonsense, a lot of foolishness is written, above all by irresponsible people, when certain documents cannot be published.

But some day mankind will know, and some day mankind will learn all the facts. That will be the day when the villains will see that comrade Guevara was not murdered; each of his steps will be fully known. They will also know then the position taken by Cuba in those difficult days, and how serene this people was. When that day comes there will be nobody, no matter how insolent, no matter how provocative, who will dare to doubt the feeling of solidarity of this people and the valor of this people—that valor demonstrated by its conduct. Despite the fact that this is a country ninety miles from the imperialist metropolis, over whose head tremendous danger will hover during the coming years, to the same extent that the revolutionary movement grows—the revolutionary movement that grows following, above all, the example of the Cuban Revolution—the growing revolutionary movement, that increases because of the example of Cuba, because of the victories of Cuba, because of Cuba's posture before the enemy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A CONFERENCE WITHOUT GLORY AND WITHOUT PROGRAM

BY ADOLFO GILLY

Those present at the final session of the Tricontinental Conference of Havana were witnesses to an extraordinary spectacle: Fidel Castro furiously attacking a guerrilla movement that is struggling, arms in hand, in the mountains and streets of Guatemala, for the socialist revolution. The attack was made at the end of the Conference, when there was no possibility for discussion or rebuttal, and took by surprise those delegates not belonging to the Communist Parties.

Fidel Castro's attack appears to be nonsensical and absurd. He accuses a revolutionary leadership that has been tested in years of struggle of being "agents of imperialism," on the sole basis of their defense of a program. But he does not say what this program is; he does not mention a single point of the program; he does not refute, debate, or argue. There is a total absence of ideas and of political discussion. It is simply an accumulation of insults and of conscious calumnies which no revolutionary could, in honest judgment, accept.

The attack is the logical and necessary conclusion of the entire evolution of Fidel Castro, accentuated after the disappearance of Che Guevara: the political alliance with the leadership of the Soviet Union, support for the general policy of peaceful coexistence, and consequently support for the pact between the leadership of *yanqui* imperialism and the Soviet leadership.

The nonsensical attack flows not from a special lack of logic on the part of the Cuban leader but from the indefensible position in which he has been placed. Fidel Castro, who has been and continues to be the leader of a socialist revolution, who has walked a revolutionary path and possesses revolutionary sentiments, must launch—in order to defend Soviet policy—an attack against and attempt to destroy the most politically influential guerrilla movement in Latin America: the guerrilla

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leadership of the Guatemalan MR-13. It is inevitable that, in undertaking this task, Fidel Castro appears to be incoherent, to lack arguments and political logic, to have lost control of himself, and that he must resort to insult and calumny.

The final speech was the culmination of the Conference's failure, which began with a disloyal and distorted attack on the Chinese, using rice as a pretext, and ended with the approval of a text with no political value, full of generalized declarations, and constituting a fraud on the responsible revolutionary movement. Even a hasty reading shows that it says nothing that has not been said a hundred times before: above all, it provides no program, no orientation, no guide for revolutionary movements.

Discussion at the Conference

The Conference was prepared in bureaucratic and administrative terms. Although delegations from revolutionary movements were present—especially from Africa and Asia—there was no prior political discussion, no text. In the case of the Latin delegations, the arbitrary decisions of the pro-Moscow Communist Parties were imposed. The Argentine votes were in the hands of the Argentine Communist Party, an isolated party which was repudiated by the *peronista* workers whom they called "fascists" in 1945 while supporting the candidate of *yanqui* imperialism against Perón, and which since then has continued to build up a black history of betrayals and political isolation. The Uruguayan votes went to the so-called Left Liberation Front, parliamentary mask of a pacifist and reformist Communist Party which has had the effrontery and indecency to attack, from its soft parliamentary easy chairs, the MR-13 movement which is fighting arms in hand against the Guatemalan dictatorship. In the Colombian delegation was the pro-Moscow Communist Party, often accused of betraying and informing on revolutionaries and *guerrilleros*. In the Guatemalan delegation there was a delegate from the Guatemalan Communist Party who had left MR-13 more than a year ago. In the Mexican delegation were the bourgeois politicians of the Popular Socialist Party, which supports the capitalist government of Díaz Ordaz. Thus the list goes, with some exceptions

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such as delegations from the MIR of Peru and the MIR of Venezuela who declared against the official line of the Conference in the only political vote that was taken.

This political vote, on whether to include the slogan of peaceful coexistence, was in reality a battle lost by the Soviet and Cuban organizers of the Conference. To be sure, they succeeded in having the slogan approved by 31 votes. But there were many abstentions. And above all, in that vote the opposition to the line of peaceful coexistence was able to unite and express itself through a front that included the three Latin American delegations (Guatemala among them) in whose countries guerrilla movements exist. The nine delegations that voted against peaceful coexistence were China, Korea, North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Japan, Indonesia, Venezuela, Peru, and Guatemala. The fact that the Guatemalan Turcios, ally of the Communist Party, voted against is an indication of the political strength of MR-13, which struggles openly against the line of peaceful coexistence and which even Turcios must respect in order not to remain without a base in his own country.

But even this vote was confused and limited. The dominant characteristic of the Conference was, since there were two opposing lines represented, the fact that in reality there was no clear political and programmatic discussion, no weighing of revolutionary experiences. Even the Chinese delegation, which led the struggle against the slogan of peaceful coexistence, did not present a revolutionary program of concrete anti-imperialist measures which would have permitted political discussion and clarification.

However, the real issue which divided the Conference and which burst out in distorted form in the insults contained in Fidel Castro's final speech, is the same as that which dominates the world revolutionary movement and, in particular, the Sino-Soviet debate: What is the program for the advance of the world revolution?

The masses, the militant revolutionaries, the militants of the workers' parties, the *guerrilleros*, find senseless a discussion based on insults and calumnious accusations which cannot be proved. They reject it; they push it aside. They find useful and necessary, on the other hand, a discussion on the program

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the revolution. They demand it. In that discussion they can intervene, they can compare positions, not insults; they can support, with arguments based on their experience and actions, the position that signifies the furtherance of the revolutionary struggle. That is what must be discussed: program, measures, and methods of struggle necessary for the furtherance of the revolution—which are correct and which are not, and why.

The Socialist Program of MR-13

This is what the Guatemalans, in MR-13, have discussed. They have stated their socialist program, and they struggle for it. They advocate and attempt the expulsion of imperialism; expropriation without indemnity of its properties and of the large capitalist firms; the granting of land to the peasants; the expropriation without payment of the *latifundios;* a sliding wage scale and a minimum wage; a single central workers' organization; democratic rights and liberties for the people of Guatemala; freedom of the press, of assembly, of organization; workers' control of production; the arming of the population; the dissolution of the army of the dictatorship; the abolition of torture and other criminal acts by the police; the repudiation of all pacts, military or other, with imperialism; the overthrow of the dictatorship through armed struggle of the masses; the establishment of a workers' and peasants' government. To implement this program they call on the masses to organize themselves in peasant committees, workers' committees, student committees, and to struggle; and it is for this program that the guerrillas of MR-13 struggle, with arms, in the mountains and in the cities.

Fidel Castro's answer was to say that there are Trotskyists in MR-13 and to hurl insults against its program, but without discussing it, without demonstrating why it is wrong, without advancing a single argument.

The absurd attack by Fidel Castro shows the boundless exasperation of his allies, the Soviet leaders, against the growing influence of that program in the Latin American revolutionary movements, and their political inability to combat it with arguments. This attack can prove nothing nor can it influence anyone, even though it can cause some passing damage.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The exasperation of those who apparently have a material strength immensely superior to that of MR-13 is typical of a defensive battle. Even at the Conference there was pressure exerted in favor of MR-13, which is widely known because of its program of socialist revolution and its conception of the role of the masses in the guerrilla struggle. It was natural that more than one delegation, from various parts of the world, should ask about it, should want to see its delegates, and should ask for an explanation of their absence. As Fidel Castro himself has said to North Americans on other occasions, there are no blockades or barriers that can stop ideas. The socialist ideas of MR-13 have spread beyond Guatemala. The absence of MR-13 was unjustified. The pressure of that fact must have been great: the Guatemalan revolutionaries were the focus of the final speech.

But the attack on the MR-13 program has a much more profound significance. It means that in Latin America the battle between the line of peaceful coexistence and the line of world socialist revolution is an open one. Fidel Castro has chosen peaceful coexistence, not only in the voting at the Conference but especially by utilizing his authority to open fire against the program of the socialist revolution. That authority was won by Fidel Castro not with the methods of peaceful coexistence but through guerrilla struggle and in socialist revolution, just as it was won by the great absent one of the Conference, Ernesto Che Guevara. That authority is good and is accepted when it serves to advance the revolution. When it is used to contain it: no. An indication of the loss of authority of the Soviet line in Latin America is that the Soviet leadership has had to accept the protection of Fidel Castro, whose leadership is of guerrilla origin. It means that it no longer has any influence with its own parties. Nor will Fidel Castro have any, with this line, since the masses will support established authority only when doing so will serve the line of their current struggles.

The Soviet leadership's interest in the Conference is clearly due to the need to establish a certain control over the development of the revolutionary movements of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. It seeks to establish forms of conciliation between the revolutionary impulse of many of these movements—and above

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all of the masses of these countries—and the general policy of coexistence with imperialism. The Soviet leadership cannot suppress these movements, it cannot make deals with them, it cannot appease them. They have their own dynamic, stimulated by the insurgency of the colonial masses. They overflow the Communist Parties and endanger the entire structure of coexistence. The Soviet leadership does not want to—nor can it—suppress that struggle, since it needs it as a base of support, but it *does* want to "regulate" it, so that it will not pass beyond the limits of general controllable pressure.

For this task the Soviet leadership needs to rely on the Latin American Communist Parties. But they have no weight or authority. The principal service that Fidel Castro can extend to Soviet policy is not to speak of peaceful coexistence; it is to pressure the revolutionary and guerrilla movements of Latin America, above all, using the authority of the Cuban workers' state, so that these movements will once more accept the alliance they had broken with the Communist Parties. It is an attempt to certify as "revolutionaries" parties and apparatuses with years of conciliation, treachery, and betrayals behind them, which have been repudiated and passed over by the new revolutionary movements. With the pretext of "unity" the Cuban leadership wants to impose that alliance on the guerrilla movements.

The attack on MR-13, and above all the bureaucratic and powerful attempt to try from Havana to change its leadership, was meant to be a warning to those who do not accept this pressure. But, as MR-13 has already replied, the leaders of the Guatemalan revolution are chosen in armed struggle in the streets and mountains of Guatemala, not in the Hotel Habana Libre. Fidel Castro has sought to apply to MR-13 the same big-power policy that the Soviet Union has exercised on Cuba. It will fail, just as the attempt to rehabilitate the pro-Moscow Communist Parties will fail.

In writing on the struggle and program of the Guatemalan guerrilla force, the editors of MONTHLY REVIEW said that when its success becomes widely enough known "it will hit the whole Latin American Left with the force of an earthquake—an earthquake, moreover, which will send out powerful tremors to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other parts of the world as well." By means perhaps not suspected by the authors of the prediction, this earthquake has been produced. MR-13 finds itself situated in the center of the political battle for the program of the world revolution and in the center of Fidel Castro's open rupture with the Chinese leadership. It is not the force of arms which has placed the developing guerrilla movement of a small Latin American country in this position but the force of its socialist program. MR-13 finds itself, furthermore, in the center of the crisis of Cuban leadership, with the disappearance of Che Guevara and the struggle and immense pressure of the Cuban masses for a political explanation of this fact and in defense of Guevara.

The Liquidation of Guevara

Now it is completely clear that one of the conditions of this alliance with the Soviet leadership and of this Conference was the disappearance of Guevara from the Cuban leadership. The same line unites the withdrawal of arms from the Cuban *milicias*, the disappearance of Che, the negotiations with the United States, the suspension of the trips of North American students to Cuba by decision of the Cuban government, the silence on the struggles of the North American masses, the pressures on the pro-Chinese North American leader, Robert Williams (who was given asylum in Cuba), the travel permits given to Cuban counter-revolutionaries to go to the United States, the attack on MR-13, the attack on the Trotskyists, the attack on the Chinese.

At the Conference itself there was a fight concerning Guevara. Not only his whereabouts but his political fate was a frequent subject of extra-official discussion among the delegates. The pressure of the Conference was added to the daily pressure of the Cuban people's demands for explanations concerning Che. Nothing would have been more logical than a message or a letter from Guevara, even though sent from an unidentified locale, greeting the Conference and manifesting his solidarity with it, or stating his political views. If the intervention of Guevara, the man of the world revolution in the Cuban leadership, had a place it was *precisely at the beginning or during the course of this Conference*. Why was there none?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What prevented Che from making a declaration, even from afar and in writing—like Lenin in 1917, like Marx when the European police hampered his movements? The restlessness of the delegates was very great, even though it did not show itself openly. One of the Venezuelan delegates, in a plenary session, delivered an impassioned speech, greeting and praising Guevara as a revolutionary—a speech that was given a standing ovation by the Conference.

It is completely logical that Fidel Castro, at the same moment in which he launched an attack on the program of socialist revolution of MR-13, should lose control of his nerves and launch into an attack, in the same insensate form, without any proof, on those who asked for an explanation of the fate of Che Guevara. Fidel Castro attacks an article by Gilly and another by Posadas, a leader of the Fourth International (Trotskyist). Both declare that Guevara was eliminated because of his line of support for the world revolution, for the extension of the Cuban Revolution, for the Chinese. The Trotskyist leader not only analyzes the political reasons for the disappearance of Guevara but relates them to the disarming of the *milicias* and declares that Guevara has been assassinated or is imprisoned, inasmuch as it is not consistent with his conception of struggle toward the Left to have suddenly resigned.*

---

* In the newspaper *Frente Obrero* of Montevideo, the same J. Posadas, leader of the Latin American Bureau of the Fourth International, publishes the following account, datelined January 27, of the situation and of the most recent, known political positions taken by Ernesto Che Guevara: "Before his disappearance, and after the dates they (the Cubans) give for his absence (they give the date of April 1), Guevara met on April 15 with our Cuban comrades who had been imprisoned and had just been freed. Guevara declared that he recognized the sincerity and revolutionary ability of the Trotskyists, and that very soon we Trotskyists would find ourselves in the trenches against imperialism. And that very soon all the works of the revolutionary, Leon Trotsky, would be published in Cuba. It should be taken into account that Guevara had attacked the Trotskyists. Not publicly, but he made a series of declarations adverse to the Trotskyists. On that occasion he said: 'The Communists call me a Trotskyist and you Trotskyists call me an adventurer.' In reality, this was not the case. The Trotskyists never called him an adventurer, but they said he makes adventures (*hace aventuras*) which is different. We have never said this of Fidel Castro. At that same meeting Guevara said to our comrades: 'Very soon we will sweep out all these conservative bureau-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fidel Castro explodes frenetically on these points. But, once again, he refutes nothing. He gives no political explanation. He insults. He says that only imperialism is interested in knowing what happened to Guevara, when all the Cuban people and the revolutionaries of the whole world are asking. His attack on Trotskyism is open ideological terrorism against the Cuban people. In synthesis he says: all those who ask for Che are Trotskyists; the Trotskyists are "mercenaries of capitalism"; consequently all those who ask for Che are "mercenaries of imperialism." He replaces political explanation with calumny and threat.

Fidel Castro can say what he wants. But *what happened to Guevara?* Fidel Castro is obliged to give a political explanation. It is not enough to shout and to attempt to use his authority —Guevara also has authority—to hush up the people. It is not imperialism, it is the revolutionaries of Latin America who are interested in knowing what they did with Guevara, because after Guevara's disappearance has come the disloyal attack on MR-13, the Chinese, the Trotskyists.

The Struggle for Revolutionary Reorientation in Cuba

The vertiginous political evolution of the Cuban leadership in recent months confirms the opinion that it is true that they have either assassinated Guevara or that they are restraining him by some means or other from expressing himself politically. Why was there no letter from him to the Conference? Why are political differences not explained? *What have they done with Guevara?* It is not enough to accuse those who ask for Guevara of being scoundrels. Scoundrels are those political cowards who a short time ago flattered Guevara as a great revolutionary, and are now silent, in solidarity and complicity with the anti-Chinese and pro-Soviet policy of Fidel Castro.

---

crats.' We had not previously made these facts public in order not to endanger Guevara's life. Convinced now that they have assassinated him, or that he is incapacitated or confined, we publish this declaration."

In the same article the Trotskyist leader says: "We accuse Fidel Castro of preparing a trial and a mass purge of the Trotskyists in Cuba. There is no place for a Stalinist epoch, but there is a place for the assassination of Trotskyists, as they have been assassinated elsewhere."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All the Cuban people are asking. Fidel Castro and the pro-Soviet Communists of Cuba cannot continue to play hide-and-seek with this profound crisis of the Cuban leadership and with the political fate of Guevara. Their margin is very narrow.

The same deception is found in Castro's statement, in the same speech, when he says that Cuba supported the Dominican Revolution and that asking for "active support" is a provocation. There is no doubt that Guevara and his friends asked for active support. And active support does *not* mean the sending of soldiers and arms, as Fidel Castro maliciously wants to make it appear, so as to contain the discontent of the Cuban masses who do not understand why Cuba did not act. That is absurd. Active support signifies the mobilization of the masses in Cuba by all possible means for the purpose of showing their support for the Dominicans, and not the mere broadcasting of declarations. It signifies calling on the Latin American masses to mobilize, it signifies giving guidance in the struggle for the defense of the Dominican Republic, providing a center in Cuba for all the spontaneous mobilizations that were taking place in Latin America. The Cuban leadership did none of these things. And when it reacts furiously in its rebuttal of a far-away journalist writing in Montevideo, it is because that same demand was made by the Cubans and it is with them that one must discuss.

All this indicates that there is a tremendous political struggle in Cuba. A policy shift like the present one does not occur casually. Nor can Guevara disappear casually. There is a current that supports Guevara, that defends his political positions. Fidel Castro is confronted by this political tendency, *guevarista* and pro-Chinese. The correspondent of *Le Monde* in Havana says that each time that Che appears on the screen or any allusion to him is made, the public bursts into thunderous applause and *vivas*. It is the Cuban people's way of struggling. And these are surely not "mercenaries of imperialism."

The Tricontinental Conference, like the disappearance of Guevara and the disarming of the *milicias*, like the attack on the Chinese and the absurd, anti-Marxist refusal to permit circulation of the Chinese material, is part of the political struggle for a revolutionary reorientation of Cuba: this current is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

developing on the island, organized or not. It is part of the struggle for the program of the world revolution. The same line unites the Guatemalan guerrillas' program, the position of the Chinese, and that of Che's supporters in Cuba. It is the line of extension of the world revolution against the line of peaceful coexistence; and for this reason Fidel Castro resorts to the struggle against Trotskyism, declaring that this is a definitive argument. The only valid arguments in this discussion are those that Fidel Castro does not dare attempt: a demonstration of why this line is bad and what, in its place, would be the correct one.

The open struggle in Cuba is part of the struggle in the entire world revolutionary movement for the program of the revolution. In this battle Fidel Castro has allied himself with the Soviets. In that alliance he has received the enthusiastic support of the Latin American Communist Parties (the same ones who called him "adventurer" and "putschist" in 1957 when he began the guerrilla struggle). The Communist Parties of Venezuela and Guatemala, always ready to negotiate away the existence of the guerrillas in exchange for parliamentary guarantees for themselves, support Fidel Castro unreservedly. All the old reformist, bureaucratic, pacifist *camarillas* led by the CP's devote themselves to spreading and praising his speeches against MR-13, the Chinese, the Trotskyists, the *guevaristas*, and all the other adversaries of peaceful coexistence. Furthermore, the great spokesmen of imperialism, such as the *Times* of London, have read in the attacks on the Chinese a sign of common sense on the part of the Cuban leader. And none other than the Minister of the Interior of Venezuela, speaking in Caracas, has greeted this attack as a change of line away from concrete, direct support for the Latin American Revolution. Imperialism has been able to judge very well the realignment of Fidel Castro who, while he devotes his last speech to an attack on MR-13 and the Chinese Communists, did not find a single occasion on which to express his solidarity with the striking New York transit workers or with the North American pro-Chinese Communist, Bill Epton (of the Progressive Labor Party), convicted by a North American court of summoning the black population of Harlem to the struggle during the 1964

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disturbances and of calling for armed defense against police repression and for the overthrow of the capitalist and imperialist order.

The government of the United States is intensifying the war in Vietnam and is preparing a general war against China and against the entire socialist camp. The Chinese not only denounce this preparation; they are readying themselves, by the hundreds of millions, for forthcoming conflict, conventional and nuclear. They have spoken clearly on this. The B-52 crash in Spain reveals the conditions under which the world is living. In this situation Fidel Castro eliminates Guevara from the leadership, openly adheres to the hope of peaceful coexistence, attacks the Chinese, and cuts his links with the Latin American revolution, attacking with calumnies and without arguments the Guatemalan guerrilla movement, socialist vanguard of Latin America.

The immense tension of the global confrontation between revolution and counter-revolution in the world is measured by what is done daily by the Vietnamese masses, focus of the world revolution. They demonstrate what is being prepared throughout the world; they are not the exception, but the burning and visible focus of the state of mind of the rest of the world's peoples. In that tension the battle for the program of the world revolution is taking place. There is a virtue in Fidel Castro's final speech to the Conference that he does not suspect: he stated the terms of the alternatives—the program of peaceful coexistence or the program of socialist revolution. By aligning himself with coexistence, Fidel Castro has dealt a blow to the Cuban Revolution and to the Latin American revolution. But the revolution is stronger—it has been proven so a thousand times—than the vacillations and retreats of the leaders.

The immense tension of the present situation has obliged Fidel Castro, the centrist, the permanent partisan of "unity," to break so-called "unity" and to move toward the Right. He has received the support of all the reformists, the pacifists, the pro-Moscow Communists, and the Venezuelan Minister of the Interior.

That same tension has placed the program of the guerrilla movement of a little Central American country in the center

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the discussion. It is because this program represents, historically, forces infinitely superior to those of the Guatemalan guerrillas. And if Fidel Castro is not, nor will he be, able to destroy the Guatemalan guerrillas, it is because these infinitely superior forces—though indirectly for a time, though unconsciously—strengthen the *guerrilleros* of MR-13 in their conviction that the socialist revolution is the road to take. And because, furthermore, the people of Guatemala support them, not the apparatuses of Moscow and Havana.

An Idea Whose Time Has Come

The leaderships of the Communist Parties—whose methods Fidel Castro is imitating in this battle—want to confine the discussion to insults, to calumnies, to rice. They have failed. These are not the issues.

What is being discussed, what should be discussed, what the masses of the world are already discussing and deciding, arms in hand, is the program of world revolution. It is the central line of the world revolutionary movement. There are not ten different lines. In sum, in definitive synthesis, there are two lines, and the partisans of one and the other, prompted by their own efforts, will find out how it was that the centrist Fidel Castro came to agree with the Soviet rightists. The lines are those of world revolution and of peaceful coexistence. Each one of them signifies a concrete program. The discussion has been opened on these programs.

MR-13 calls for support of the program of socialist revolution. It expounds it, it applies it, it defends it. This call has crossed the borders of Guatemala; it has had echoes in Peru, Venezuela, Colombia, Uruguay, the United States, Honduras; it has crossed many other frontiers because forces beyond the frontiers were already moving in the same direction. The attack of the Soviet leadership, as expressed by Fidel Castro with the support of the parliamentary and pacifist Communist Parties, indicates that the strength of that program is growing continuously and that the influence of the Chinese Revolution throughout Latin America will tend increasingly to fuse with it.

The discussion should focus and define itself on that line, not on insults or calumnies or in betrayals to the police by the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bureaucrats. The revolutionaries, the militant socialists and Communists, the anti-imperialists of all Latin America, of the United States, and of other countries must discuss and decide on this line, in support of the socialist Guatemalan guerrillas. This line provides a bulwark for the revolutionary tendency which supports Guevara's position in Cuba, which must demand an explanation of Guevara's fate. Thus the discussion will not serve, through meaningless diatribes, the turbid interests of the efforts at alliance between the bureaucratic leadership of the Soviet Union and the leadership of *yanqui* imperialism—an enterprise in which Fidel Castro has now become entangled—but the interests of the revolutionary struggles of the world's peoples.

The socialist guerrilla movement of Guatemala, the Revolutionary Movement of the 13th of November, must be supported; it is the center of the struggle for the Latin American socialist revolution. It must be defended as a precious conquest in the advance of socialism on the entire continent, north and south, in Latin America and in the United States. MR-13 has rejected Fidel Castro's attacks, but it has reiterated at the same time that it defends the Cuban workers' state and the Cuban socialist revolution unconditionally and with every possible means. In April 1965, the editors of MR wrote:

> The Latin American and world revolutionary movements owe a great debt of gratitude to the Guatemalan guerrillas. Not only have they fought bravely and well in the best revolutionary tradition. Above all, they have had the moral and intellectual courage—a rarer quality than physical courage—to reject accepted dogmas and defy "higher authority" by fighting openly and proudly for a *socialist* revolution.

That moral and intellectual courage has placed them, with their limited forces, in the center of this struggle, in confrontation with powerful enemies; Guatemalan and Latin American capitalism, *yanqui* imperialism, and the bureaucratic leadership of the Soviet Union and its allies. They are facing all these enemies valiantly and well. They will conquer, because the program of the socialist revolution has already taken root in the armed, revolutionary struggle of Latin America, as it took root earlier in socialist Cuba. Because, as is known, there is nothing more powerful in the world than an idea whose time has come.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CITY IS THE BLACK MAN'S LAND

BY GRACE AND JAMES BOGGS

Population experts predict that by 1970 Afro-Americans will constitute the majority in 50 of the nation's largest cities. In Washington, D.C., and Newark, N.J., Afro-Americans are already a majority. In Detroit, Baltimore, Cleveland, and St. Louis they are one third or more of the population and in a number of others, e.g., Chicago, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Oakland, they constitute well over one fourth. There are more Afro-Americans in New York City than in the entire state of Mississippi. Even where they are not yet a majority, as in Detroit, their school children are now well over 50 percent of the school population.

In accordance with the general philosophy of majority rule and the specific American tradition of ethnic groupings (Irish, Polish, Italian) migrating en masse to the big cities and then taking over the leadership of municipal government, black Americans are next in line. No previous ethnic grouping has ever constituted as large a proportion of the urban population; yet each in turn achieved first-class citizenship chiefly because its leaders became the cities' leaders. But racism is so deeply imbedded in the American psyche from top to bottom, and from Right to Left, that it cannot even entertain the idea of black political power in the cities. The white power structure, which includes organized labor, resorts to every conceivable strategy to keep itself in power and the black man out: urban renewal or Negro removal; reorganization of local government on a metropolitan area basis; population (birth) control. Meanwhile since their "taxation without representation" is so flagrant, safe Negroes are appointed to administrative posts or hand-

---

James Boggs is the author of *The American Revolution: Pages From a Negro Worker's Notebook,* which appeared both as the special double summer issue of MR in 1963 and as a paperback book. Grace Boggs is his wife.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

picked to run for elective office. In Hitler-occupied Europe such safe members of the native population were called collaborators or Quislings.

All these schemes may indefinitely delay or even permanently exclude the black majority from taking over the reins of city government. There is no automatic guarantee that justice will prevail. But those who invent or support such schemes must also reckon with the inevitable consequences: that the accumulated problems of the inner city will become increasingly insoluble and that the city itself will remain the dangerous society, a breeding place of seemingly senseless violence by increasing numbers of black youth, rendered socially unnecessary by the technological revolution of automation and cybernation, policed by a growing occupation army which has been mobilized and empowered to resort to any means considered necessary to safeguard the interests of the absentee landlords, merchants, politicians, and administrators, to whom the city belongs by law but who do not belong in the city and who themselves are afraid to walk its streets.

America has already become the dangerous society. The nation's major cities are becoming police states. There are only two roads open to it. *Either* wholesale extermination of the black population through mass massacres or forced mass migrations onto reservations as with the Indians. (White America is apparently not yet ready for this, although the slaughter of 32 blacks in Watts by the armed forces of the state demonstrates that this alternative is far from remote.) *Or* self-government of the major cities by the black majority, mobilized behind leaders and organizations of its own creation and prepared to reorganize the structure of city government and city life from top to bottom.

This is the dilemma which Northern liberals have been evading ever since May, 1963, when the Birmingham city masses (Birmingham is over 40 percent black) took the center of the stage away from Dr. Martin Luther King and precipitated the 1963 long hot summer of demonstrations, followed by the 1964 long hot summer of uprisings in Harlem, Philadelphia, Rochester, New York, and New Jersey. The McCone Commission has warned that the 1965 revolt in Watts may be only a curtain-raiser to future violence in the nation's ghettos unless

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the public adopts a "revolutionary attitude" towards racial problems in America; and Vice President Humphrey proclaims that the "biggest battle we're fighting today is not in South Vietnam; the toughest battle is in our cities." But the war is not only *in* America's cities; it is *for* these cities. It is a civil war between black power and white power, the first major battle of which was fought last August in Southern California between 18,000 soldiers and the black people of Watts.

A revolution involves the conquest of state power by oppressed strata of the population. It begins to loom upon the horizon when the oppressed—viewing the authority of those in power as alien, arbitrary, and/or exclusive—begin to challenge this authority. But these challenges may result only in social reform and not in the conquest of power unless there is a fundamental problem involved which can be solved only by the political power of the oppressed.

It is because labor is becoming more and more socially unnecessary in the United States and another form of socially necessary activity must be put in its place that a revolution is the only solution. And it is because Afro-Americans are the ones who have been made most expendable by the technological revolution that the revolution must be a black revolution.

If the black liberation movement had erupted in the 1930's in the period when industry was in urgent need of unskilled and semi-skilled labor, it is barely possible (although unlikely in view of the profound racism of the American working class and the accepted American pattern of mobility up the economic and social ladder on the backs of others) that Afro-Americans might have been integrated into the industrial structure on an equal basis. But the stark truth of the matter is that today, after centuries of systematic segregation and discrimination and only enough education to fit them for the most menial tasks abandoned or considered beneath their dignity by whites, the great majority of black Americans now concentrated in the cities cannot be integrated into the advanced industrial structure of America except on the most minimal token basis. Instead, what expanding employment there has been for Afro-Americans has been in the fields of education and social and public service (teaching, hospitals, sanitation, transportation, public health,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recreation, social welfare). It is precisely these areas which are the responsibility of city government, and it is also precisely these areas of activity which are socially most necessary in the cybercultural era. But because the American racist tradition demands the emasculation of blacks not only on the economic and sexual but also on the political level, the perspective of black self-government in the cities cannot be posed openly and frankly as a profession and perspective towards which black youth should aspire and for which they should begin preparing themselves from childhood. Instead, at every juncture, even when concessions are being made, white America makes clear that the power to make concessions remains in white hands. The result is increasing hopelessness and desperation on the part of black youth, evidenced in the rising rate of school dropouts, dope addiction, and indiscriminate violence. Born into the age of abundance and technological miracles, these youths have little respect for their parents who continue to slave for "the man," and none for the social workers, teachers, and officials who harangue them about educating themselves for antediluvian jobs.

The fundamental problem of the transformation of human activity in advanced America is as deeply rooted as the problem of land reform in countries which have been kept in a state of underdevelopment by colonialism. Like the colored peoples of the underdeveloped (i.e., super-exploited) countries, Afro-Americans have been kept in a state of underemployment, doing tasks which are already technologically outmoded. But where 75 to 80 percent of the population in a country like China or Vietnam live in the countryside, a comparable proportion of Afro-Americans now live in the cityside. And whereas countries like China or Vietnam still have to make the industrial revolution (i.e., mechanize agriculture and industry), North America has already completed this revolution and is on the eve of the cybercultural revolution. Socially necessary activity for the majority in an underdeveloped country is essentially industrial labor; education for the majority is vocational education. The peasantry has to be educated to the need to abandon outmoded farming methods, prepare itself for technological change, and meanwhile to be mobilized to work to provide the necessary capital for modern machinery. It can be educated and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mobilized for this gigantic change only through its own government. In an advanced country like the United States, on the other hand, the black population, concentrated in the cities, has to be educated and mobilized to abandon outmoded methods of labor and prepare itself for the socially necessary activities of political and community organization, social services, education, and other forms of establishing human relations between man and man. As in the case of the underdeveloped countries, this can be achieved only under its own political leadership. Hence the futility of the War on Poverty program which is essentially a program to keep the poor out of the *political* arena where the controlling decisions are made and to train them for industrial tasks which are fast becoming as obsolete in advanced North America as farming with a stick already is in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

* * *

Marcus Garvey and Elijah Muhammad, the only two leaders who ever built mass organizations among urban blacks, both recognized the need for self-government if the Afro-American was ever to become a whole man. Both of them seemed to understand intuitively Aristotle's dictum that "man is a political animal." Garvey created a political apparatus and proposed a "Back to Africa" program which to many seemed fantastic. It was difficult for him to do otherwise in the period after the First World War when Negroes were making their first mass migration to the big cities from the agricultural hinterland but had not yet reached sufficient numbers or development for him to envisage their political leadership of the cities. Muhammad's strength has also been in Northern cities. His most pronounced achievement, the rehabilitation of black men and women, was based on his philosophy that the so-called Negro would inevitably rule his own land, and his creation of an organizational framework ("The Nation of Islam") which approximates the structure of government, including leaders, followers, taxation, discipline, and enforcement agencies. Muhammad's weakness has been his failure to recognize the significance of technological development in an advanced country; hence his concentration on land ownership and small businesses. Also, as so often happens with those who build a powerful organization, he became

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

preoccupied with the protection of the organization from destruction by a determined enemy. As a result, when the Northern movement erupted in 1963, he did not take the offensive which, consciously or unconsciously, large numbers of non-Muslim blacks (the so-called "80 percent Muslims") had been hoping he would take. It was this failure by Elijah Muhammad to take the offensive which led to Malcolm X's split from the organization. That such a split was inevitable was already portended in Malcolm's now-famous speech to the Northern Negro Grassroots Leadership Conference in Detroit on November 10, 1963, in which he analyzed the Black Revolution as requiring a conquest of power in the tradition of the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution. Malcolm was assassinated before he could organize a cadre based on his advanced political ideas, but in one of his last speeches he made very clear his conviction that "Harlem is ours! All the Harlems are ours!"

It was in 1965 that black militants began to discuss black power seriously. Before 1965 the movement had been so dominated by the concept of integration, or the belief that the "revolution" would have been accomplished if American Negroes could win equal opportunity to get jobs, housing, and education, that even those black militants who are profoundly opposed to the American way of life devoted a major part of their time and energies to the civil rights struggle. What, up until 1965, few black militants had grappled with is the fact that *jobs* and *positions* are what *boys* ask to be *given*, but *power* is something that *men* have to take and the taking of power requires the development of a revolutionary organization, a revolutionary program for the reorganization of society, and a revolutionary strategy for the conquest of power.

As early as August, 1963, at the March on Washington, the idea of black power had been anticipated in John Lewis's speech threatening to create another source of power, and in the announcement of the formation of a Freedom Now Party by William Worthy. In 1964 the Freedom Now Party won for itself a place on the ballot in the state of Michigan and conducted a state-wide campaign running candidates for every state-wide office and stressing the need for independent black political action. The party did not win many votes, but it con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tributed to the establishing of the idea of independent black political power inside the Northern freedom movement. In early 1965 a Federation for Independent Political Action was created in New York by militant black leaders from all over the country who went back into their communities to link the idea of black power with concrete struggles. On May 1, 1965, a national Organization for Black Power was formed in Detroit.

The first task which the Organization for Black Power set itself was to establish a scientific basis for the perspective of black political power in the historical development of the United States. Thus, the following statement was adopted at the founding conference:

At this juncture in history the system itself cannot, will not resolve the problems that have been created by centuries of exploitation of black people. It remains for the Negro struggle not only to change the system but to arrive at the kind of social system fitting to our time and in relation to the development of this country.

That Negroes constitute this revolutionary social force, imbued with these issues and grievances that go to the heart of the system, is not by accident but a result of the way in which America developed. The Negroes today play the role that the agricultural workers played in bringing about social reform in agriculture and the role that the workers played in the 1930's in bringing about social reform in industry.

Today the Negro masses in the city are outside of the political, economic, and social structure, but they constitute a large force inside the city and particularly concentrated in the black ghettos.

The city itself cannot resolve the problems of the ghetto and/or the problems of the city. The traditional historical process by which other ethnic groupings were assimilated into the economic and political structure has terminated with the arrival of the Negroes en masse (1) because of the traditional racism of this country which excludes Negroes from taking municipal power as other ethnic groupings have done; and (2) because of the technological revolution which has now made the unskilled labor of the Negroes socially unnecessary. The civil rights movement which originated in the South cannot address itself to these problems of the Northern ghetto which are based not upon legal (*de jure*) contradictions but upon systematic (*de facto*) contradictions. It remains therefore for the movement in the North to carry the struggle to the enemy in fact, i.e., toward the system rather than just *de jure* toward new legislation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At this conference we arrived at the recognition that the prop, the force, that keeps the system going is the police which is an occupation force of absentee landlords, merchants, politicians, and managers, located in the city, and particularly in the black ghetto, to contain us.

Negroes are the major source of the pay that goes to police, judges, mayors, common councilmen, and all city government employees, taxed through traffic tickets, assessments, etc. Yet in every major city Negroes have little or no representation in city government. WE PAY FOR THESE OFFICIALS. WE SHOULD RUN THEM.

The city is the base which we must organize as the factories were organized in the 1930's. We must struggle to control, to govern the cities, as workers struggled to control and govern the factories of the 1930's.

To do this we must be clear that power means a program to come to power by all the means through which new social forces have come to power in the past.

(1) We must organize a cadre who will function in the cities as the labor organizers of the 1930's functioned in and around the factories.

(2) We must choose our own issues around which to mobilize the mass and immobilize the enemy.

(3) We must prepare ourselves to be ready for what the masses themselves do spontaneously as they explode against the enemy—in most cases, the police—and be ready to take political power wherever possible.

(4) We must find a way to finance our movement ourselves.

Since the founding conference, and particularly since the Watts revolt and deepening crisis of the United States occupation of Vietnam, black revolutionaries all over the country have been working out the theory and practice of building a black revolutionary organization.

(1) They are clarifying what black political power would mean in real terms, that is to say, the program which black government in the cities would institute. Thus, for example, black political power would institute a crash program to utilize the most advanced technology to free people from all forms of manual labor. It would also take immediate steps to transform the concept of welfare to one of human dignity or of well-faring and well-being. The idea of people faring well off the fruits of advanced technology and the labors of past generations without the necessity to work for a living must become as normal as the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

idea of organized labor has become. There should be no illusion that this can be accomplished without expropriating those now owning and controlling our economy. It could not therefore be accomplished simply on a city-wide basis, i.e., without defeating the national power structure. However, by establishing beachheads in one or more major cities, black revolutionary governments would be in the most strategic position to contend with and eventually defeat this national power structure.

In elaborating its program, the black revolutionary organization, conscious that the present Constitution was written nearly two centuries ago in an agricultural era when the states had the most rights because they had the most power, will also aim to formulate a new Constitution which establishes a new relationship of government to people and to property, as well as new relationships between the national government, the states, and the cities, and new relationships between nation-states. Such a Constitution can be the basis for the call to a Constitutional Convention and also serve to mobilize national and world support for the black government or governments in the cities where they establish beachheads and where they will have to defend themselves against the counter-revolutionary forces of the national power structure.

(2) They are concentrating on the development of paramilitary cadres ready to defend black militants and the black community from counter-revolutionary attacks. The power which these cadres develop for defense of the community can in turn bring financial support from the community as well as sanctuary, when needed, in the community.

(3) The most difficult and challenging task is the organizing of struggles around the concrete grievances of the masses which will not only improve the welfare of the black community but also educate the masses out of their democratic illusions and make them conscious that every administrative and law-enforcing agency in this country is a white power. It is white power which decides whether to shoot to kill (as in Watts) or not to shoot at all (as in Oxford, Mississippi, against white mobs); to arrest or not to arrest; to break up picket lines or not break up picket lines; to investigate brutality and murder or to allow these to go uninvestigated; to decide who eats and who

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

goes on city aid when out of work and who does not eat and does not go on city aid; to decide who goes to what schools and who does not go; who has transportation and who doesn't; who has garbage collected and who doesn't; what streets are lighted and have good sidewalks and what streets have neither lights nor sidewalks; what neighborhoods are torn down for urban renewal and who and what are to go back into these neighborhoods. It is white power which decides which people are drafted into the army to fight and which countries this army is to fight at what moment. It is white power which has brought the United States to the point where it is counter-revolutionary to, and increasingly despised by, the majority of the world's peoples. All these powers are in the political arena, which is the key arena that the black revolutionary movement must take over if there is to be serious black power.

It is extremely important that concrete struggles and marches, picket lines and demonstrations, be focused on the seats of power so that when spontaneous eruptions take place the masses will naturally form committees to take over these institutions rather than concentrate their energies on the places where consumer goods are distributed. Political campaigns to elect black militants to office play a useful role in educating the masses to the importance of political power and the role of government in today's world. They are also a means of creating area organizations. But it should be absolutely clear that no revolution was ever won through the parliamentary process and that as the threat to white power grows, even through the parliamentary process, it will resort to all the naked force at its disposal. At that point, the revolution becomes a total conflict of force against force.

(4) The most immediate as well as profound issue affecting the whole black community and particularly black youth is the war in Vietnam. The black revolutionary organization will make it clear in theory and practice that the Viet Cong and the black power movement in the United States are part of the same world-wide social revolution against the same enemy and that, as this enemy is being defeated abroad, its self-confidence and initiative to act and react are breaking down at home. This is the revolutionary task which Malcolm was undertaking and the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reason why he was assassinated. Like the black youth of Watts, the black revolutionary organization will make it clear that black youth have no business fighting in the Ku Klux Klan army that is slaughtering black people in Vietnam. Their job is to defend and better their lives and the lives of their women and children right here. Moreover, speaking from a power base in the big cities even before there is a national revolutionary government, black city governments are the only ones which could seriously talk with the governments of the new nations without resorting to the power that comes out of the barrel of a gun, as the United States must do today.

One final word, particularly addressed to those Afro-Americans who have been brainwashed into accepting white America's characterization of the struggle for black political power as racist. The three forms of struggle in which modern man has engaged are the struggle between nations, the struggle between classes, and the struggle between races. Of these three struggles, the struggle of the colored races against the white race is the one which includes the progressive aspects of the first two and at the same time penetrates most deeply into the essence of the human race or world mankind. The class struggle for economic gains can be, has been, incorporated within the national struggle. Organized labor is among the strongest supporters of the Vietnam war. The struggle of the colored races cannot be blunted in such ways. It transcends the boundaries between nations because historically the colored peoples all over the world constitute a black underclass which has been exploited by the white nations to the benefit of both rich and poor at home.

In the struggle of the colored peoples of the world for the power to govern themselves, the meaning of man is at stake. Do people of some races exist to be exploited and manipulated by others? Or are all men equal regardless of race? White power was built on the basis of exploiting the colored races of the world for the benefit of the white races. At the heart of this exploitation was the conviction that people of color were not men but subhuman, not self-governing citizens but "natives." White power not only exploited colored peoples economically; it sought systematically to destroy their culture and their personalities and anything else which would compel white people to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

face the fact that colored peoples are also men. When Western powers fought each other, they fought as men. But when they fought colored peoples, they killed them as natives and as slaves. That is what Western barbarism is doing in Vietnam today. Now the black revolution and the struggle for black power are emerging when all people are clamoring for manhood. Thereby they are destroying forever the idea on which white power has built itself, that some men (whites) are more equal or more capable of self-government (citizenship) than others (colored).

I would like to subscribe to

MONTHLY REVIEW

☐ 1 year $6 ☐ 2 years $10 ☐ 3 years $14

NAME .....

STREET .....

CITY ..... STATE ..... ZIP .....

☐ New Sub ☐ Renewal

I enclose $..... for a ..... year subscription.

Special subscription rate to students — $4.00

Name of college .....

Fr. ☐ Soph. ☐ Jr. ☐ Sr. ☐ grad. school ☐

FOREIGN RATES:
One year, $7; by 1st class mail, $11; by air mail, North America $11, South America and Europe $15, Asia, Africa, Australia $17.

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review 333 Sixth Ave. New York, N. Y. 10014

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MONOPOLY IN THE UNITED STATES

BY DAVID MICHAELS

One of the most significant Congressional investigations in the postwar period is currently under way under the direction of liberal Democratic Senator Philip Hart of Michigan. These are the hearings which will extend over a two-year period before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly which is looking into the crucial problem of economic concentration in the American economy. The hearings should be of great interest for many reasons. Not since the 1930's, when the National Resources Committee published its landmark *The Structure of the American Economy* and the Temporary National Economic Committee accumulated mountains of data on the same subject, have the crucial statistics necessary for analyzing the extent and nature of concentration been made available. In fact, the hearings promise to help fill the lack bemoaned by the editors of MONTHLY REVIEW in their inaugural issue of May 1949 when they stated:

> What has been happening to the American economy in these very important respects [monopoly and the concentration of economic power] during the last decade and a half? Unfortunately, to assemble the relevant facts requires much laborious research and access to material which is not normally made public; the job, in short, can only be done by a liberally financed investigation which has the cooperation of a number of government agencies. Needless to say, neither money nor cooperation has been available for such obviously subversive activities in recent years.

The bulk of the hearings to date consists of the presentation and interpretation of different sets of data by various witnesses, generally pointed toward arguing the extent of concentration today, its effect on technological progress and efficiency, and whether or not there is a tendency toward increasing monopolization. Much of the divergence which exists

---

This article is a review of the U.S. Senate *Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly: Economic Concentration,* Parts 1-4, July 1964-September 1965. David Michaels is the pen name of an economist working in New York.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

both among witnesses and among Congressmen appears to be due to differing political philosophies: in general "liberals" see a great amount of concentration curtailing efficiency and progress, and a trend in the postwar period toward increasing monopoly; "conservatives" do not. The "ideological struggle" is partly waged on the methodological plane, in particular about how to measure the degree of concentration. Should we use the leading firms' share of sales, or total assets, or net profits? Should we take the top four firms in any industry, or the top eight, or the top twenty? Is the economy as a whole the relevant universe, or each separate industry? How do we define an "industry"? The answers to questions of this kind tend to be decided on the basis of how they affect each faction's general thesis on monopoly.

A virtue of this polemical approach is that many different types of data are presented. With this wealth of information, the main outlines of the postwar situation emerge clearly enough. First, there is a high degree of concentration in the American economy as a whole. The five largest corporations account for 13 percent of all manufacturing corporate assets, the 50 largest have 36 percent of the total, the 200 largest have 57 percent, and the 1,000 largest have 76 percent—out of a total of 180,000 corporations engaged in manufacturing. Even more important, the share of the largest in total net profits (after taxes) is: top 5—20 percent; top 50—48 percent; top 200—68 percent; and the top 1,000—86 percent. About one percent of all manufacturing corporations accounts for almost 90 percent of all net profits, while the other 99 percent get only 10 percent of the total.

Second, there has been a strong tendency toward increasing overall concentration in the postwar period. For all corporations, the share of total assets of the largest 200 has increased sharply, from 49 percent in 1950 to 55 percent in 1962. Most of this increase in concentration is undoubtedly due to the fact that the largest corporations are generally the most profitable ones: the largest 200 manufacturing corporations in 1962 averaged almost 8 percent profit on their total assets, while the others earned less than 5 percent. To illustrate the significance of this, had these same rates of profitability prevailed throughout

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the 1950 to 1962 period, and both the 200 largest corporations and all the others as a group had plowed back half of their profits into increased assets, then the largest 200's share of total assets would have risen in these 12 years from 49 percent to 53 percent (compared to the actual increase from 49 percent to 55 percent).

In addition, a significant part of this increasing concentration is due to the high (and accelerating) rate of corporate mergers and acquisitions in recent years. The top 200 manufacturing corporations acquired almost 1,900 other companies during the 1950-1962 period! Total assets of these acquired companies amounted to almost $14 billion, or an average of $7 million each. Moreover, most of the swallowed-up firms were both large and thriving prior to acquisition. As the chief economist of the Federal Trade Commission, Dr. Willard Mueller, noted:

> We have found that very few large acquired corporations were failing concerns, or even losing money in the year prior to being acquired. . . . Only 17 of the 165 acquired corporations for which we have financial information were losing money in the year prior to being acquired. . . . On the other hand, 58 of the acquired corporations enjoyed earnings on net worth of over 10 percent and 90 of over 7.5 percent in the year preceding acquisition. This suggests that many of the acquired concerns were very profitable enterprises, and had they not been acquired they most likely would have continued as healthy economic enterprises capable of offering effective competition. (*Hearings*, Part 1, p. 128.)

It is this increasing concentration caused by mergers and acquisitions of "smaller companies" which is the main concern of the "liberal" faction of the Senate committee. In particular they are troubled by the increasing tendency toward "conglomerate" corporations, i.e. corporations which produce a number of different kinds of goods and services.

Some major conglomerates which are analyzed in detail in these hearings are Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing, General Dynamics, Olin Mathieson, FMC Corp., and Textron. (Total assets of these five equal $3 billion.) Minnesota Mining, while best known for "Scotch Tape," makes some 27,000 different products, ranging from cameras to sulphuric acid to electrical insulators, in addition to owning the Mutual Broadcasting

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

System! Textron, "practically a textbook example of a merger-created conglomerate," has evolved from a small textile company into 27 separate divisions and 113 plants: its most important line is now helicopters, but it also makes such widely dissimilar products as chicken feed, chain saws, fiberglass boats, portable space heaters, gas meters, men's dress shoes, lawnmowers, outboard motors, aluminum foil mills, optical machinery, linseed oil, electric golf carts, marine fittings, and scores more. No longer managed by textile people, Textron is now run, *Fortune* says, by a "conservative and unsentimental banker," and a former Wall Street lawyer, "also no sentimentalist."

What are the causes of this conglomerate growth? Numerous possible factors are discussed in the hearings, but to this reviewer at least two appear to be decisive: (1) the drive for profitable investment outlets, which is particularly true for the largest corporations since as shown they are the most profitable ones; and (2) the attempt of major corporations to cushion themselves from the business cycle or from excessive reliance on government—thus, a cement company combines with an aerospace firm.

Corporate profits in recent years have been so high that, despite enormous outlays for new plant and equipment and greatly increased dividend payments to stockholders, liquid assets in corporate treasuries have been growing tremendously. The growth of these idle funds has been accelerated (while the growth of "true" corporate profits has been obscured) by the great increase in "depreciation" charges, which have been deducted as costs from profits while the actual cash remains in the firm. At the same time, the largest corporations have been squeezed between the Scylla of excess capacity in their own business and the Charybdis of antitrust laws hindering takeover of directly competitive firms (horizontal integration) or their own suppliers or marketers (vertical integration). Hence, it is natural that they should seek a way out through acquisition of firms in unrelated businesses.

Whatever the motivation for conglomerate growth, the different reactions of "liberals" and "conservatives" to this form of concentration is most interesting. The liberals in general find this concentration to be bad *per se*. This is based only

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

partly on their traditional belief that any type of monopoly is bad because it can lead to economic inefficiency and profiteering and potentially dangerous concentration of political power. The significant new thing about conglomerate concentration is stated by Dr. Walter Adams, Professor of Economics at Michigan State:

> A conglomerate giant is powerful, therefore, not because it has monopoly or oligopoly control over a particular market, but because its resources are bigger than those of its specialized competitors, and because these resources are diversified over many different markets. . . . It occupies a position much like the millionaire poker player who, in a game of unlimited stakes, can easily bankrupt his less opulent opponents—regardless of his comparative mastery over the dizzy virtues of probability theory. . . .
>
> Whatever the virtues of such conglomeration may be, it cannot lay claim to the two central advantages that popular mythology attributes to other forms of bigness. Unlike horizontal or vertical bigness which under some circumstances may be conducive to efficiency and technological progressiveness, conglomerate bigness almost never possesses these characteristics. Since by its very nature the conglomerate firm is composed of functionally unrelated enterprises, it loses the advantages of specialization and the economies of scale pertaining thereto. It also sacrifices the specialized skills and know-how which in other giant firms may be conducive to research achievements, invention, and innovation . . . therefore, conglomerate giantism is probably the least conscionable form of economic power and, where it appears in highly concentrated form, it might be well considered a fit candidate for dissolution. (*Hearings,* Part 1, p. 249.)

As the above quotation implies, the usual defense of traditional forms of monopoly lay in the claim, most clearly articulated by the late well known conservative economist, Joseph Schumpeter, that concentration allowed efficiency in the short run through economies of mass production and technological progress in the long run. The crucial role of big business in promoting technological progress has also been argued by the famous liberal economist, J. K. Galbraith: "A benign providence . . . has made the modern industry of a few large firms an almost perfect instrument for inducing technical change. . . ." (Cited in *Hearings,* Part 2, p. 1119.)

Part 3 of the *Hearings,* dealing with "Concentration, Invention, and Innovation," presents much interesting material

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

casting considerable doubt on the existence of any causal relationship between size and invention. Even more significant perhaps, not only for the United States but for other economies, is the analysis in Part 4, "Concentration and Efficiency," indicating declining plant concentration, which "tend(s) to support the hypothesis that technology has reversed its long-term trend and is now making for optimal efficiency in smaller sizes of plants." (Dr. John Blair, *Hearings*, Part 4, p. 1550.) Clearly if this is true it has major implications for economic planning, Marxist theory, and many other areas.

Finally, to this reviewer, one of the most significant aspects of these hearings is the impingement of external factors, and particularly the United States balance of payments crisis, on an area generally considered solely a domestic problem. Thus, while the current defense of conglomerate growth builds on the traditional defense, it gives it a new twist by placing the question of size within the context of the world economy, rather than the national economy. While a giant United States conglomerate may be too big for effective competition from United States competitors, it will not be immune from competition from major rival firms in other capitalist countries or blocs. Dr. J. Fred Weston, Professor of Business Economics and Finance at the University of California, Los Angeles, put forth this view:

> The next stage of world economic development will be one in which a greater emphasis on a world division of labor will be required, particularly by the free countries of the world. The future position of a nation in the world economy will depend upon its relative efficiency. The Congressional laws toward mergers should shift from a negative attitude to a positive one. The easy identification of concentration with bad economic effects requires re-examination. The emphasis of public policy should be on promoting efficiency in industry rather than on preventing concentration. . . .
>
> The American economy has been protected fortuitously against the intensity of competition from the other developed countries of Europe by the political disunity of Western Europe, the only other developed part of the world. But, with the development of economic blocs and the Common Market, it is clear that the Europe of the future will see the rise of very large firms specialized by country and supplying the entire economic bloc with steel or chemicals or computers and instruments. These large-scale opera-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions will subject U.S. firms to greater competition both in the United States and in third countries. . . .

The interdependent world of the future requires that American industry be able to compete in world markets. *If this is not the case, the American economy will be unable to solve its balance-of-payments problem.*

In some industries concentration may be associated with inefficiency; in other industries concentration is associated with superior performance. Rather than condemn all concentration, I recommend a simple and powerful public policy action: expose all industries, concentrated and unconcentrated alike, to the rigors of the world competition in the international marketplace. . . .

. . . It seems to me that we are in danger of hobbling and shackling American industry and large American firms and reducing their ability to compete effectively in the world economic markets. (*Hearings,* Part 1, pp. 144-46. Emphasis added.)

Dr. John Blair, the Subcommittee's chief economist, who is generally hostile to conglomerates, remarked upon completion of the above testimony: "Your emphasis on the necessity of meeting competition in world markets may make you a prophet well ahead of the economics profession as a whole." (*Hearings,* Part 1, p. 146.) However, this emphasis already has received important Congressional support, coming in fact from those generally classified as liberals (indicating the very limited usefulness of the liberal-conservative dichotomy when it comes to questions affecting vital international economic and political interests of the United States). For example:

Senator Jacob Javits today introduced a bill to establish a federal commission to review the nation's antitrust laws. The Republican lawmaker claimed that present laws put U.S. firms at a competitive disadvantage with foreign firms. A companion bill was scheduled to be presented in the House of Representatives under joint sponsorship of New York Republicans John V. Lindsay and Ogden R. Reid. (*New York World-Telegram & Sun,* March 1, 1965.)

These facts drive home once again the growing United States involvement in, and dependence on, world economic and political developments which are increasingly difficult to control. We hope to deal in a later article with a crucial manifestation of this phenomenon, the gold and balance-of-payments crises of the United States.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

The "New" Economics

Government and business circles in the United States are complimenting one another on the success of the "new" economics. After 1918, boom-and-bust shattered the world economy and severely damaged that of the United States. The past twenty years in the United States have been "depression free." Moral: a private enterprise economy properly managed can abolish the boom-bust business cycle.

How is this result brought about? By having government put one or more fingers in the economic pie: using higher taxes and more costly money to restrain expansion; lowering taxes, making money cheaper, and increasing government spending at the first sign of recession. Under the "new" pattern, the economy is no longer free to determine its own levels by spending, investing, and competing in the open market. On the contrary, government taxing and spending, plus government control of the cost of money and government subsidies, are used to guide or control the economy. The root principle is government spending when necessary for the maintenance of buying power.

Under President Eisenhower the principle was applied hesitantly. President Kennedy accepted the principle and followed it with great confidence. The Johnson administration has integrated government taxing, spending, and lending into the economy.

Alliances between government and business are not new. Mercantilism, which preceded the *laissez-faire* economy advocated by Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill, made government and business partners in the operation of monopolies like the East India Company and the Hudson Bay Company. It was protest against such arrangements that led to the separation of government from business, leaving business free to go

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its own way and establish its own level of prices, wages, and profits.

Very early in the free-enterprise era it became evident that business could not go it alone. Government regulation of coinage, tariffs, franchises, and subsidies for lagging industries all involved government interference in business. Congress passed the Interstate Commerce Act in 1887, the Antitrust Law in 1890. Later, banking and stock jobbing were brought under public control. When the Japanese decided to modernize, government initiated the industrialization drive. Increasingly government has regulated, controlled, and managed national economies.

Mussolini's Italy and Hitler's Germany managed their economies, going far beyond similar efforts in the United States. War losses left Italy and Germany no alternative. In both countries private business had reached the end of its tether. Government stepped in to mitigate losses and avoid disaster. A few years later, between 1929 and 1933, Hoover and Roosevelt rushed to the assistance of industries, railroads, and banks teetering on the brink of insolvency.

Unless I miss my guess, economists and historians in 1980 will be bracketing Hoover, Roosevelt, Hitler, and Johnson together as four political leaders who turned to managed economies as the only real alternative to socialization. Should this assumption prove to be correct, Lyndon B. Johnson will not be listed as the author of a "new" economic principle. On the contrary, he will be the President who tried to avoid the breakdown of capitalist economy by following the lead of Hitler and crowding bankrupt corporate enterprise into a fascist straitjacket.

A Fascist Pattern for United States Transportation

President Johnson stated the issue incisively in the message on transportation which he sent to Congress on March 2. Transportation's share of the total economy has grown even more rapidly than national productive power. This growth has been particularly noteworthy since war's end in 1945.

After flattering his private-enterprise backers by stating that "the United States is the only major nation in the world that relies primarily upon privately owned and operated transportation," the President continued: "That national policy has served

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

us well." But, he added, "Private ownership has been made feasible only by the use of publicly granted authority and the investment of public resources" in inland waterways, rivers and harbors, highways, airports, subsidies to the merchant marine.

The transport network has grown without any general plan. "Consequently, America today lacks a coordinated transportation system. . . . Both people and goods are compelled to conform to the system as it is, despite the inconvenience and expense" of obsolete plants, inadequate equipment, failure to use the new technology. To meet these urgent problems, President Johnson does not suggest more private enterprise. On the contrary, he recommends a department of transportation in the Washington government which will promote efficiency and safety in the transportation network. In effect, private enterprise having failed to meet new transportation needs, the remedy is the subordination of private enterprise to public authority. Italian, Japanese, and German oligarchs reached the same conclusion long ago.

The next step, of course, is the elevation of transportation to a place side by side with public health and public education—moving from private enterprise, through the present fascist stage, to the integration of transportation into the structure of a socialist society.

"New" Direct-Action Diplomacy

What could be more logical than to turn from "new" economics to "new" patterns of imperialism? The world revolution is leaving its imprint on politics as well as on economics.

With startling facility Washington and its ex-imperialist NATO allies have shifted from an emphasis on law, treaties, and constitutions as instruments of empire domination to direct action based on armed force. Overnight Washington sent 20,000 fully equipped Marines into the tiny Dominican Republic (population 2,850,000). In a few months and without any declaration of war, United States occupation forces in South Vietnam jumped from 20,000 to 200,000. Neither action was legalized; both violated laws, treaties, constitutions.

A survey of recent events in Latin America, Asia, and Africa reveals many features of the new imperialism. Imperialists

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Latin America have shifted from the Monroe Doctrine, which was directed at European rivals of North American imperialists, to the Kennedy-Johnson Doctrine: Socialism-communism in any form will not be tolerated in the Western Hemisphere.

Hence the Washington-directed blockade of Cuba, and the CIA attempt at armed invasion. Peronism in Argentina and Goulartism in Brazil both questioned State Department pronouncements. First in the Argentine, then in Brazil (the most populous and richest states of South America) the armed forces overthrew duly elected governments, flouted the constitutions, suspended civil rights, proclaimed military rule, suppressed, imprisoned, and executed their opponents. The reward: prompt recognition by the State Department, close ties with the United States Defense Department, government aid, and private investments.

The suppression of the People's Progressive Party in British Guiana, military occupation by British armed forces, planned race riots, periods of near civil war, and the installation of a coalition government amenable to Washington-London pressures was quite in line with Kennedy-Johnson policies.

Following postwar withdrawals of Britain and France from important sections of Africa, with the subsequent establishment of republican governments ruling in accordance with popularly adopted constitutions, American, British, and French imperialists began by recognizing the new African governments and welcoming them into the United Nations. The British and French then used armed force in the Suez crisis. American, Belgian, and British imperialists used armed force and some mercenaries in North Africa and the Congo.

In the winter of 1965-1966, in seven African countries, local military forces overthrew duly elected republican governments; dissolved parliaments; suspended constitutions; arrested, imprisoned, and assassinated their opponents; and proclaimed military dictatorships. In some cases, notably the Congo, high-handed military action led to civil war. In all cases the new rulers were able to establish themselves, take over the reins of government, and win diplomatic recognition from the leading imperialist powers.

Direct-action diplomacy overthrew the socialist govern-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment of Ghana in February 1966. The military seized power, warned the elected president not to return to the country, expelled Russian and Chinese personnel, cancelled contracts with socialist countries. The reward was instantaneous. *The New York Times* cheered the liquidation of another "socialist" country in Africa. The State Department quickly recognized the new military regime.

During the two decades following 1945, imperialists were either driven out of Asia by armed force or they withdrew from Asia to forestall expulsion, leaving Indians, Indonesians, Chinese, Ceylonese, and Burmese to adopt governments of their own choosing. The tide of self-determination began to turn with the United States occupation of South Korea and Taiwan, the overthrow of the Iranian and other Near East governments by armed force, the military putsch in Indonesia, and the military occupation of Southeast Asia by armed forces from the United States, Australia, New Zealand, and West Germany.

Twenty years earlier the imperialists had been expelled from Asia by aroused populations who were talking the language of social revolution. Now imperialist armed forces are moving back into the seats of power, cooperating with local military dictatorships which proclaim their anti-communism.

These recent episodes in the cold-war, anti-communist drive of the NATO powers have a number of features that seem to mark the emergence of a direct-action diplomacy aimed at the restoration of imperialist controls over the lives of colonials, who won independence and presumably self-determination during the turbulent years which preceded and followed the war of 1939-1945.

- NATO powers are by-passing laws and constitutions, and relying on armed force as the chief means of destroying unwanted governments.
- Armed force is provided by the imperialists, in cooperation with the local military authorities.
- Governments established as a result of military action are under the personal direction of generals and admirals, with a sprinkling of civilian subordinates.
- Civil law is replaced by military law.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

- Military dictatorships are harsh, subjecting their opponents to detention without trial, loss of civil rights, exile, torture, and murder.

Under this direct-action cold war diplomacy, laws, treaties, and constitutions become scraps of paper. Government by contract or by consent disappears. Might replaces right. Such procedures marked the rise of fascist governments in Italy, Japan, and Germany during the 1920's and 1930's. They arise at a point in the disintegration of capitalism at which the capitalist oligarchy finds it necessary to alter the political ground-rules in order to protect its properties and privileges. The new direct-action diplomacy is fascism operating at the international level.

Direct-Action Philanthropy

Reporters on Vietnam have written and typed millions of words during the past twelve months. It has remained for David Lawrence, editor of *U.S. News & World Report* to say the last word: " 'Philanthropy' is defined by the dictionary as an act of service performed because of 'love for mankind.' What the United States is doing in Vietnam is the most significant example of philanthropy extended by one people to another that we have witnessed in our time. . . . In being willing to make big sacrifices to defend the people of Vietnam, the United States has shown an unselfishness notable in history." (From Editorial "Vietnam—Our Great Philanthropy," *U.S. News & World Report,* February 2, 1966.)

On previous pages of the same issue, *U.S. News* listed the present yearly rate of ammunition used by the American forces in South Vietnam: 1 billion rounds of rifle and machine-gun ammunition; 10 million bombs; 9.4 million 40mm. grenades. Without mentioning the damage to life and property, the editorial notes that the United States is "prepared to provide even more [fire-power] in an effort to save American lives."

Surely this is direct-action philanthropy with a vengeance!

I don't like to hit a village. You know you're hitting women and children, too. But you've got to decide that your cause is noble and that the work has to be done.

—American Pilot in Vietnam, quoted by *The New York Times,* July 7, 1965

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS BOOKS IN PRINT

		List Price	Price With Sub*
ECONOMICS			
The Political Economy Of Growth—Baran		$ 5.00	$ 9.00
Lands Alive—Dumont		6.75	10.50
Capitalism Yesterday and Today—Dobb	paper	1.00	7.00
The Accumulation Of Capital—Luxemburg	cloth	7.50	11.00
	paper	3.95	8.50
Monopoly Capital—Sweezy		8.75	13.00
The Theory Of Capitalist Development—Sweezy		6.00	10.00
PHILOSOPHY			
Marxism and Moral Concepts—Ash		3.50	8.00
Pride Of State—Morray		4.00	8.50
Consciencism—Nkrumah		3.50	8.00
The Alienation Of Modern Man—Pappenheim	paper	2.45	7.00
A Philosophy Of Man—Schaff		3.25	8.00
SOCIOLOGY			
The American Revolution—Boggs	paper	1.00	7.00
Caste, Class, And Race—Cox		7.50	11.00
A New World in the Making—Dolci		7.50	11.00
Waste—Dolci		6.75	10.50
Studies in a Dying Colonialism—Fanon		4.95	9.00
SOCIALIST THEORY			
The Communist Manifesto—Marx and Engels		2.50	7.00
In Place Of Fear—Bevan		4.50	9.00
Marxism Of Our Time—Martinet		3.25	8.00
Parliamentary Socialism—Miliband	paper	3.45	8.00
The Socialist Register, 1964 Miliband and Saville, eds.	cloth	6.00	10.00
The Socialist Register, 1965 Miliband and Saville, eds.	cloth	6.00	10.00
	paper	3.45	8.00
Three Tactics: The Background In Marx—Moore		2.25	7.00
HISTORY			
The Menace Of The Miracle—Abosch		5.00	9.00
Capitalism As A System—Cox		6.50	10.50
Man's Worldly Goods—Huberman	paper	2.95	7.50
We, The People—Huberman		5.00	9.00
From Yalta To Disarmament—Morray		8.50	12.00
Revolution In Seattle—O'Connor		5.00	9.00
The Present As History—Sweezy	paper	2.95	7.50

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

		List Price	Price With Sub*
BIOGRAPHY			
William Morris: The Man And The Myth—Arnot		3.25	8.00
View From The West—Cockburn		3.75	8.50
Paul A. Baran: A Collective Portrait—Sweezy and Huberman, eds.		3.50	8.00
EDUCATION			
Education And The Working Class—Jackson and Marsden		6.75	10.50
Soviet Education Today—Levin		4.00	8.50
WORLD AFFAIRS			
Burning Conscience—Eatherly and Anders		4.00	8.50
Guerrilla Warfare—Guevara		3.50	8.00
The Empire Of Oil—O'Connor		5.00	9.00
World Crisis In Oil—O'Connor	cloth	7.50	11.00
	paper	3.95	8.50
LATIN AMERICA			
Explosion Over Latin America (The Man At The Door With The Gun)—Belfrage	paper	2.75	7.25
The Man At The Door With The Gun—Belfrage		4.50	9.00
Whither Latin America?—Fuentes and others	cloth	3.00	7.50
	paper	1.75	7.00
Puerto Rico: Freedom And Power In The Caribbean—Lewis		10.00	14.00
The Ordeal Of British Guiana—Reno	cloth	3.25	8.00
	paper	1.45	7.00
CUBA			
Inside The Cuban Revolution—Gilly		2.50	7.00
Cuba: Anatomy Of A Revolution—Huberman and Sweezy	cloth	3.50	8.00
	paper	1.75	7.00
The Second Revolution In Cuba—Morray		3.25	8.00
The United States, Cuba, And Castro—Williams		3.25	8.00
CHINA			
China Triumphs—Alvarez del Vayo		5.00	9.00
The Timely Rain: Travels in New Tibet—Gelder		8.95	13.00
Notes From China—Robinson	paper	.75	6.75
The Great Road—Smedley		6.75	10.50
NOVEL			
The Ragged Trousered Philanthropists—Tressell		6.00	10.00
The Road to Spain—Morris		4.95	9.00
POETRY			
Report To The Stockholders—Beecher		3.00	7.50
THE ARTS			
Review I—edited by Frances Kelly	cloth	3.00	7.50
	paper	1.00	7.00

(*All foreign subs, add $1 to price quoted. Prices in pounds sterling can be obtained from our London office.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XVII

Author	Title	No.	Page
A Specialist	*Socialism And The Market*	4	38
Baran, Paul A. and Paul M. Sweezy	*Notes On The Theory Of Imperialism*	10	15
Bettelheim, Charles	*Reply To Dobb*	8	35
	Socialism And The Market	4	36
	The Quality Of China's Socialism	2	45
Boggs, Grace and James	*The City Is The Black Man's Land*	11	35
Boorstein, Edward	*Planning And Development: A Review*	10	57
Braden, Anne	*The Southern Freedom Movement In Perspective*	3	all
Buchanan, Keith	*Behind The Curtain Of Silence*	7	44
	China: A Spanish View: A Review	4	56
	China Through French Eyes: A Review	8	57
	South Vietnam: Some Perspectives	1	46
Castro, Fidel	*From Closing Speech At Tricontinental*	11	12
Charrière, Jacques	*Socialism In North Vietnam*	9	19
Cockcroft, James D. and Eduardo Vicente	*Venezuela And The FALN Since Leoni*	6	29
Deane, Hugh	*Across The River in South Vietnam: A Review*	1	57
de la Puente, Luis F.	*The Peruvian Revolution: Concepts And Perspectives*	6	12
Dobb, Maurice	*Socialism And The Market*	4	30
Dunham, Barrows	*I Wanted Him To Know*	9	53
Frank, Andrew Gunder	*Services Rendered*	2	41
Galeano, Eduardo	*Che Guevara—The Bolivar Of Our Time?*	10	34
Gilly, Adolfo	*A Conference Without Glory And Without Program*	11	21
	A Guerrilla Wind	6	41
	Guerrillas And "Peasant Republics" In Colombia	5	30
	The Guerrilla Movement In Guatemala Part I	1	9
	Part II	2	7
	Vietnam: A War Of The Masses And A Socialist Revolution	7	30
Girbau Leon, Vincente	*Imperialism In The Dominican Republic*	4	9

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Author	*Title*	*No.*	*Page*
Harburg, E. Y.	*On That Great Civilized Morning*	10	14
Horowitz, David	*Technique And Society: A Review*	2	58
Huberman, Leo	*Freedom Under Capitalism And Socialism*	5	14
Iranian Students Association	*Is Iran Potentially Another Vietnam?*	8	31
Kalecki, Michal	*On Paul Baran's* Political Economy Of Growth	6	58
Lathrop, Peter	*Telling And Teaching*	9	42
McAdoo, William	*A Letter From Prison*	1	41
Mauro Marini, Ruy	*Brazilian "Interdependence" and Imperialist Integration*	7	10
Michaels, David	*Job Discrimination In The South*	4	40
	Monopoly In The United States	11	47
Morrock, Richard	*Rhodesia: Historical Background*	8	10
Newman, Steve	*Oglesby's Speech*	10	43
Nearing, Scott	See World Events		
Oglesby, Carl	*Liberalism And The Corporate State*	8	21
Review Of The Month	*Decolonization At Home*	5	1
	Revolution And Counter-Revolution In The Dominican Republic	4	1
	Tell The Truth	2	1
	The Boom Continues	9	1
	The Breakthrough In Guatemala	1	1
	The Necessity Of Revolution	7	1
	The Rhodesian Crisis	8	1
	The Tricontinental And After	11	1
	Vietnam: A New Phase Opens	10	1
	War And Revolution	6	1
Robinson, Joan	*Cuba—1965*	9	10
Rosenberg, Paul S.	*Economic Reform And Socialist Morality*	10	48
Rossant, M. J.	*War And U.S. Economy (from Toronto* Globe and Mail*—Sept. 28, 1965)*	6	46
Solganick, Allen	*Economic Reform And Socialist Morality*	10	46
Sweezy, Paul M. with Paul A. Baran	*Gert And MR*	6	54
	Notes On The Theory Of Imperialism	10	15
Toronto *Globe and Mail*	*War And U.S. Economy*	6	46
Vicente, Eduardo and James D. Cockcroft	*Venezuela And The FALN Since Leoni*	6	29
Wheeler, George Shaw	*Economic Reform In Czechoslovakia*	8	39
World Events		In every issue except 3	

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SEEKING A PUBLISHER?

Book publication is one of the foundation stones of a scholar's career in gaining recognition and advancement. Under its special academic imprint, *Exposition University* offers you a complete publishing service . . . including editorial supervision, a dynamic marketing and promotional program, and professional distribution.

Your inquiries and manuscripts are invited (all subjects welcomed). An editorial report furnished without obligation.
FREE: Two fact-filled, illustrated brochures explain the behind-the-scenes story of publishing, describe our first edition plan, and present a breakdown of contract terms and typical costs.

Write Dept. 128 D
EXPOSITION PRESS
386 Park Ave., So., N.Y., N.Y. 10016

(Advertisement)

KNOW CANADA
Read CANADIAN DIMENSION
CANADA's Magazine of the LEFT

Some articles from recent issues:

- THE ROLE OF U.S. INVESTMENT IN THE CANADIAN ECONOMY
- SOCIALISM AND NATIONALISM IN QUEBEC
- A CRITIQUE OF THE NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY
- CANADA AND VIETNAM
- THE NEW MILITARY IN CANADIAN LABOUR
- CANADIAN FOREIGN POLICY AFTER NATO

U.S. correspondent is Robert Scheer. Other American contributors include Staughton Lynd, James Petras, Bayard Rustin.

6 issues—$3.00 12 issues—$5.00

Write CANADIAN DIMENSION
P.O. Box 1413
Winnipeg 1, Manitoba, Canada

(Advertisement)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)

One is entitled *Fanshen* which means in Chinese "to turn over." It is subtitled *A Documentary of Revolution in a Chinese Village*. The book was written by William Hinton, an American who went to China after the Second World War as an agricultural technician attached to the United Nations Rehabilitation and Relief Agency (UNRRA). Through a series of circumstances described in the book, he became an observer attached to a work team sent by the Chinese Communist government (which controlled only part of China at the time) to examine the progress of land reform in a North Shansi village. Mr. Hinton first went to Long Bow (the English name he has given the village) in March 1948, some two years after it was liberated by the Red Army from Japanese control. He stayed for six months and during this time he was able to watch and record the day-to-day events of the decisive phase of the Chinese Revolution at its most fundamental level. We have no hesitation in describing this as an historic document with profound relevance to the contemporary world revolutionary scene.

The other book is Andrew Gunder Frank's *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America: The Cases of Chile and Brazil*, a sweeping reinterpretation of Latin American history as an aspect of the world-wide spread of capitalism in its commercial and industrial phases. Frank's book also has a profound relevance to the contemporary world revolutionary scene: by laying to rest the myth of Latin American feudalism it demonstrates the impossibility of a bourgeois revolution in that part of the world and therefore throws into sharp relief the necessity and inevitability of socialist revolution as the next stage of Latin American history. We will be in a position to make prepublication offers for both books in the near future.

One of our recurring problems is a shortage of good translators. Spanish and French are the main languages concerned, but we also occasionally need translations from other languages such as Portuguese, German, and Italian. If any MR readers with translating experience are available on a volunteer basis, please let us know. If you happen to have a sample of your work on hand, send that too.

Another continuously harrassing problem is to keep track of those of you who change your address and don't let us know. The magazine is sent to your old address, and months later, it comes back to us from the post office; at that point we have no other option—we *must* take you off the sub list. *Unless you let us have your change of address (both the old and the new) you will not get the magazine regularly.* There is nothing we can do about it. You and we already have enough problems with the rapidly deteriorating mail service in the United States; let's not add another. Send us your change of address, please.

And another way you can help us with the burden of record keeping and record searching: don't send us a check or money order without telling us what it is for! The MR office sells subs, pamphlets, magazines, and books—please tell us precisely what your payment is for and precisely where what you are ordering is to be mailed. Thanks very much.

We had hoped to find space to comment on those parts of the Boggs' article in this issue with which we disagree. Perhaps at a later date we can return to some of the problems they pose. Meanwhile, readers are invited to send in their comments.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS

Monthly Review Press announces the third of a series of annual volumes:

edited by

An analysis of contemporary issues and ideas which are both topical and also of lasting interest.

The Labour Government and Beyond	RALPH MILIBAND
The Italian Left	LELIO BASSO
The Crisis of Belgian Social Democracy	MARCEL LIEBMAN
The Spanish Left: Illusion and Reality	L. TORRES
British Trade Unionism in the Sixties	J. HUGHES
Yugoslavia's Crossroads	B. MCFARLANE
European Capitalism and World Trade	M. BARRATT BROWN
Natural Science and Human Theory: A Critique of Herbert Marcuse	P. SEDGWICK
The Outlook for Africa	BASIL DAVIDSON
Varieties of African Socialism	J. MOHAN
The New Class and Rebellion in the Congo	J. GERARD-LIBOIS
Problems of Socialism in South East Asia	MALCOLM CALDWELL
India and Pakistan: Twenty Years After	V. H. KIERNAN

Special combination offer: all 3 volumes
THE SOCIALIST REGISTER 1964, 1965, 1966

List Price: $18.00 **Price until July: $12.00**
Associates' price: $9.00

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Ave. New York, N. Y. 10014

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED